DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 795 AC 006 135

AUTHOR	HAYGOOD, KENNETH
TITLE	CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE IN MASSACHUSETTS.
PUB DATE	APR 68
NOTE	125P.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$6.35
DESCRIPTORS	ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *ANNUAL REPORTS, *COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS, EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *FEDERAL AID, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, INNOVATION, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, PROGRAM EVALUATION, STATE PROGRAMS, *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
IDENTIFIERS	HIGHER EDUCATION ACT, MASSACHUSETTS

ABSTRACT

THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION IN ORDER TO PROVIDE BACKGROUND, A PROGRESS REPORT, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION TO THOSE INTERESTED IN THE MASSACHUSETTS PROGRAMS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FUNDED UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. AMONG THE MATERIALS EXAMINED WERE THE ACT ITSELF AND THE REGULATIONS GOVERNING ITS ADMINISTRATION; DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM FROM THE FILES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1966, 1967 AND 1968; PROPOSAL SUMMARIES FOR THOSE YEARS; AND OTHER RELEVANT BACKGROUND PAPERS. INCLUDED IN OTHER REPORTS STUDIED ARE THREE BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: (1) FEDERALLY SUPPORTED COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS - A FIVE STATE SURVEY - (AUGUST 1967); (2) INVENTORY OF FEDERALLY SUPPORTED EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS (MARCH 1967); (3) IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES (OCTOBER 1967). A FOURTH REPORT WAS PREPARED FOR THE MASSACHUSETTS HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION PROJECTS IN MASSACHUSETTS UNDER TITLE I OF THE FEDERAL HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 BY THE ORGANIZATION FOR SOCIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION (NOVEMBER 1967). THE DOCUMENT INCLUDES EIGHT APPENDICES AND A LIST OF TABLES. (SE)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED035795

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE IN MASSACHUSETTS

A Report to the Higher Education Facilities Commission on Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

By KENNETH HAYGOOD

April, 1968

AC006135

ED035795

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE
IN MASSACHUSETTS

A Report to the Higher Education
Facilities Commission on Title I
of the Higher Education Act of
1965

APRIL, 1968 BY KENNETH HAYGOOD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I

PERSPECTIVE 4

The Potential 6

The Limitations 8

Present Status 13

Conclusions 16

Recommendations 17

CHAPTER II

DIRECTIONS OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM 21

National Directions 21

Recommendations of the National Advisory Council 22

Additional Plans of the National Advisory Council 25

Directions for Title I in Massachusetts 26

The Relation of Future Directions of Title I in Massachusetts to Federal Activities 31

CHAPTER III

THE STATE AGENCY IN MASSACHUSETTS 33

Federal Requirements for the Administration of the State Agency 33

The Establishment of the State Agency 33

The Performance of the State Agency 34

The View of the National Advisory Council on the Role of the State Agency 36

The Author's View 38

CHAPTER IV

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL 45

Future Tasks for the Advisory Council 47

CHAPTER V

THE STATE PLAN - MASSACHUSETTS 50

Meeting the Objectives of the HEA 1965 61

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT OF A FOCUS FOR THE STATE PLAN 66

Specific Steps Undertaken 69

Focus: Local Government 70

The Importance of Local Government as a Focus for the State Plan 72

Recommended Action on Massachusetts State Plan Focus 76

Relevance of Local Government Focus to National Problems 78

CHAPTER VII

DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE AND EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS 79

Organizational Innovations 80

Educational Innovations 83

APPENDICES

A. Biographical Data About Author 88

B. Correspondence Arranging for Preparation of this Report 90

   1. From Executive Director, HEFC, to author, December 14, 1967.

   2. Memorandum from author to Executive Director, December 27, 1967. 90

C. The Acts to which the National Advisory Council directs its attention. 94

D. Policies and Procedures for the Advisory Council and its Sub-Committees Under Title I (HEA 1965). 96

E. Memorandum to members of the State Agency designated to Administer Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. 100

F. Continuing Education Resource Center, Montclair State College 108

G. Syracuse University Institute on Community Service Programming. 109

H. Projects Funded under Title I HEA 1965, for Fiscal Years 1966, 1967 and 1968. 111

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary Statistics on Title I, HEA 1965, for Fiscal Years 1966-1968, Commonwealth of Massachusetts 14

2. Number of Title I Grants Awarded, by Amount of Grants, Total Funds Awarded in Grant Size Categories, and Percentage in each of Total Funds Granted for the Year (1966-1968) 54

3. Institutions Submitting Title I Proposals and Receiving Grants, 1966-1968 56

4. Geographical Distribution of Title I Proposals Funded and Not Funded 1966-1968 57

5. Title I Proposals by Categories of Community Service 1966-1968 59

6. Problem Areas Named by all States and by Massachusetts Fiscal 1967 (Title I, HEA 1965) 67

7. Problem Areas Named by States, Fiscal 1968 (Title I, HEA 1965) 68

INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared at the request of the Higher Education Facilities Commission in order to provide background, a progress report, and recommendations for future action to those interested in the Massachusetts programs of continuing education and community service funded under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Much of the thinking contained in this report is the result of the author's participation in the Massachusetts program, where he has served on the Advisory Council, the Proposal Selection Committee, and the Committee on Development of the State Plan. In addition, he served as Project Director of one of the first projects funded in Massachusetts.

The author also has served as a consultant on Title I programs in the states of Maine, New York, Connecticut, and California, and he has used this experience in arriving at certain of the recommendations presented in this report. (See Appendix A, Biographical Data about author and Appendix B, correspondence arranging for preparation of the report.)

Among the materials examined were the Act itself and the regulations governing its administration; documents concerning the development of the program from the files of the Higher Education Facilities Commission; the Massachusetts State Plan amendments for Fiscal Years 1966, 1967 and 1968; proposal summaries for those years; and other relevant background papers. In addition, the following reports commissioned by the U. S. Office of Education were examined:

1. Federally Supported Community Service and Continuing Education Programs - A Five State Survey - by Greenleigh Associates, Inc. (August 1967)

2. Inventory of Federally Supported Extension and Continuing Education Programs - by Greenleigh Associates, Inc. (March 1967)

3. In-Service Training of State and Local Officials and Employees - by Leo Kramer, Inc. (October 1967).

Another report, prepared for the Massachusetts Higher Education Facilities Commission was also studied:

4. Projects in Massachusetts under Title I of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1965 - by The Organization for Social and Technological Innovation (November 1967).

Also used were the first and second Annual Reports of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, dated March 31, 1967 and March 31, 1968, respectively.[1]

In addition, the persons listed below acted as an Advisory Committee to the author as he wrote this paper:

---

[1] The National Advisory Council was appointed in February, 1966 according to the provisions of the Act. This Council was charged with the responsibility of reviewing the administration and effectiveness of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program and making recommendations for improving the program in its annual reports.

Mr. Edward F. Bocko, Executive Director, Higher Education Facilities Commission (HEFC).

Dr. Lawrence E. Fox, Senior Research Associate, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education (MACE).

Dr. Richard V. McCann, Director, Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, New England Region.
Dr. McCann was Executive Director of HEFC when Title I, HEA 1965 was enacted and the State Agency was established in Massachusetts.

Dr. Leo Redfern, Dean of Administration, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Dr. Redfern is a commissioner of HEFC and serves as liaison to the Advisory Council on Title I, HEA 1965.

The author also visited the United States Office of Education to gather data on the Title I program from the perspective of the national office, including information on the progress of the Title I program in other states.

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the Director and staff of the Higher Education Facilities Commission, the Director and staff of the Division of Adult Education Programs of the U. S. Office of Education, and all those interviewed and consulted in the preparation of this paper. Their help was essential and freely given, and has contributed greatly to this report. However, the conclusions and recommendations are the responsibility of the author.

CHAPTER I

PERSPECTIVE

During the past half-century more and more institutions of higher education have been developing continuing education and community service programs as a part of their on-going activities. Indeed, continuing education is increasing at a much more rapid rate than education for young people and will continue to do so. In addition, continuing education is called on more and more frequently to assist in the strengthening of community resources and the solution of community problems.

In spite of the increasing demand for continuing education and community service programs, these activities (with the exception of Agricultural Extension programs) have generally been carried on without adequate financial support or public mandate.

To overcome this deficiency many individuals and national organizations concerned with university extension and continuing education have lobbied for and sponsored federal legislation during the past twenty years. Their efforts finally resulted in the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which contained Title I, Continuing Education and Community Service Programs.

When this long-awaited legislation emerged from Congress it raised hopes of great accomplishments in continuing education and community service. However, the Act was far from ideal; to date it has not alleviated the problems it sought to solve, and in some ways it has compounded them. In fact, the more one works with Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the more one becomes aware of its great potential and its aggravating limitations. These will be discussed in greater detail in the following pages.

To date, time and energy of those concerned with Title I in Massachusetts has been directed primarily toward getting the program under way. Now that projects have been funded for the third year, it is time to shift the emphasis to long-range concerns. If the Title I activities fail to go considerably beyond their present level of development in Massachusetts, a great opportunity will be missed - an opportunity to bring institutions of higher education into more effective working relationships with state and local agencies, voluntary community associations and individual citizens for coordinated efforts to solve community problems. Should this occur, the Commonwealth will not attain a position of leadership among the states nor achieve the high level of performance expected of educational efforts in Massachusetts.

Administratively speaking, Massachusetts can claim to have its house about as tidy as most other states. However, in terms of actually developing a program that identifies high priority community problems and then effectively mobilizes the resources to deal with them, Massachusetts has a long way to go. At the present level of activity, this state is falling behind a number of other states, who not only have overcome the difficulties of mounting the program but have now gone well beyond this basic task and are building imaginative state-wide programs focusing on both short and long-range goals.

Actions taken now in Massachusetts should be directed toward the future, when more funds will be available and more ambitious programming will be possible. The present low level of Title I activity, resulting from the small appropriations from the Federal government and the failure of the state to make any financial contribution, offers valuable time for setting up task forces to gather information about how high priority community problems can best be attacked; involving concerned institutions, agencies, organizations and individuals in the development and execution of the state plan; and building up resources for that date in the future when the Title I program will receive the funds it needs to be effective in solving community problems.

The recommendations contained in this report will suggest ways in which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can use Title I to build a significant statewide program of continuing education and community service and to do so within the mandate and limitations of the existing legislation.

The Potential

The passage of Title I legislation signalled the recognition by the Administration and the Congress of a need to mobilize the resources of the institutions of higher education to help solve the problems of their communities. It also recognized the fact that the problems of each of our communities are of concern to the nation as well as to their local areas, and that most of the problems are common to many communities, overlapping our traditional political subdivisions, making them regional and national, as well as local.

At the national level, Title I financial assistance makes it possible to attack these problems on several fronts at once. The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education has set itself the task of surveying the community problems which might be ameliorated by programs which use the resources of the institutions of higher education. When completed, the survey will provide the National Council with the data upon which to base a system of national priorities for program development and funding. In addition, the Council plans to provide technical assistance to the states, and to engage in continuing evaluation of the program's progress toward national goals. The national Title I staff will also link Title I with other federal programs such as the State Technical Services Act of 1965, Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964, and the Smith Lever Act of 1914. (A description of the purposes of these Acts is included as Appendix C). By combining the resources available, and working cooperatively on joint projects sponsored under these different acts, greater progress might be obtained in the solution of community problems.

At the state level, similar activities are called for which, if implemented, would provide direction and unity for community-wide plans, providing for continual re-examination of problems, mobilization of resources for their solution, and the setting of priorities to deal with problems of the community in state-wide and local terms, as well as in relation to national goals and priorities.

At the local level, the institutions of higher education are encouraged to become involved with representatives of the community in defining local problems, determining the resources available for dealing with the problems they discover, and developing plans both for helping to solve the problems and building their resources for additional cooperative work.

This decentralized operation of the Title I program demands leadership at all three levels of its administration and requires cooperative relationships between the federal and state Title I administrations, between the states and the institutions of higher education, and between the institutions and other organizations in the communities.

Further, the concept of Title I as a program of continuing education and community service links the educational function to the process of community problem solving, and makes continuing education relevant as a public concern. This approach broadens and extends the continuing education approach which traditionally has emphasized education as an individual-directed process, and therefore essentially a private concern.

While the funds available for the Title I program are limited at the moment, there is reason to believe that the obvious necessity for this kind of program and the visible benefits derived from the funds that are now available will ultimately lead to a much more generous allocation of money by federal, state and local governments.

Such an increase in funds is badly needed. At no time in our history have the problems of our communities been more acute. The old problems are tenacious and resistant, while new ones crowd in beside the old and challenge our best efforts at solution. A high level of leadership and cooperation is required to meet the challenge of Title I so that the resources of the local, state and national communities would be coupled to the resources of institutions of higher education and channeled into efforts at solving the many complex problems of the modern community.

The Limitations

The most fundamental limitations of the present Title I program have been caused by the Act's lack of clarity with regard to basic purposes, and with regard to the means by which institutions of higher education are to be involved in the pursuit of these purposes. Its effectiveness has also been limited by insufficient money and by difficulties in developing and administering the Act.

For many years, those who were concerned about university extension and continuing education had attempted to obtain federal financial assistance in order to strengthen existing programs and to develop new ones. Their expectation from this legislation was that financial assistance would be made available to build the resources of the institutions of higher education to serve the adults of their communities in a variety of ways, including programs which would help to solve community problems.

The legislation that was finally enacted, on the other hand, specified that financial assistance should be used for developing the institutions' resources exclusively for community problem solving.

These two purposes are not necessarily the same. Not all continuing education needs may be seen as related to urgent problems in the community, and the resources of the institutions for community problem solving may not be concentrated in their continuing education programs.

Combining "continuing education", "community service", and "community problem solving" has caused confusion as to what the Act really is intended to accomplish. In addition, the Act does not state how, or through what organizational arrangements the institutions are to be involved in community problem solving.

Because no role is spelled out for the institutions, as was done in the Smith-Lever Act establishing Cooperative (agricultural) Extension as the community service agency to deal with agricultural and rural problems, the basic questions were left unresolved, namely;

1. What is the role of continuing education in community service programs?

2. How can institutions of higher education most effectively be involved in community problem solving activities?

Since Title I legislation did not resolve these fundamental questions, it has heightened the confusion, at least during these early years of the program.

It also had been hoped that the new Act would help to overcome the duplication, discontinuities, and lack of coordination between federal programs having similar purposes. Another hope was that legislation could be developed which would serve to integrate agricultural extension and general extension activities with related programs which were being carried on independently. The Title I legislation has not achieved these objectives.

Another limitation is that the legislation called for creating structures to develop and implement a "statewide comprehensive and coordinated plan for continuing education and community service". This meant adding still more organizational structures at the state level at a time when many new agencies and organizations were being set up to deal with education and community problems,[1] and further complicated the task of getting Title I off the ground with a minimum of time and staff. There were also requirements that all institutions of higher education should be informed of the legislation and that governmental agencies and representatives of the community be involved in planning and carrying out the program. The task of informing was simple. An official memorandum mailed to each institution fulfilled this requirement. The task of involvement required a more sustained and creative approach which has not yet occurred.

---

[1] Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 came on the scene in Massachusetts at a time when there was considerable upheaval in higher education. The Willis-Harrington Report, completed in 1964, had recommended the establishment of a Board of Higher Education for the coordination of the State's institutions of higher education. This Board was set up in 1965, and when Title I was funded, it had not yet resolved the many problems surrounding its own start-up phase.

Other federal programs had also been started recently, including the State Technical Services Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Programs of Cooperative Extension had been in existence for many years, but were not coordinated with these newer activities.

Financially speaking, the ten million dollars per year that was actually appropriated is insufficient to encourage many institutions to go out of their way to develop resources and activities that might have a measurable impact on community problems. On the other hand, the amount is large enough to give Congress and the public the expectation that significant progress would be made in solving community problems. In fact, the amount of money available to Massachusetts has been a little under one quarter of a million dollars per year, which averages out to less than five cents a person per year in Massachusetts, so unless efforts are concentrated on specific community problems and audiences there can be little expectation of bringing about solutions under this legislation alone.

Another factor which has complicated the development of the legislative program in Massachusetts and elsewhere has been the uncertainty of funds. For example, the legislation enacted in November, 1965 authorized 25 million dollars for the Fiscal Year 1966, and 50 million dollars for Fiscal Years 1967 and 1968. However, Congress has appropriated only ten million dollars for each of the three years of the program to date, on a year to year basis which makes it very difficult to plan ahead. Furthermore, the matching funds requirement was not decided by Congress at the time that Fiscal 1968 proposals were being submitted. The sponsoring institutions therefore did not know whether their share would be 25% as in previous years, or 50% as the act required for subsequent years. This made it necessary for them to commit themselves to a 50% matching ratio, possibly eliminating some valuable proposals due to financial inability.

Finally, the legislation was so enacted that there was little coordination between the availability of funds and the deadlines for proposal submission. For example, the legislation was enacted in November 1965, but regulations for funding were not available until April 8, 1966. The State then had to interpret and prepare the regulations governing the submission of proposals, so that it was May 3rd before these regulations were sent out, along with the request for proposals. Institutions wishing to submit proposals had to notify the Higher Education Facilities Commission of their intention to do so by May 9, and the deadline for receipt of proposals was May 16th. The proposals had to be screened and approved and a State Plan Amendment prepared and submitted before June 30th, 1966.

Following this hectic first round, proposals for Fiscal 1967 were solicited one month later in July, 1966. There was slightly more time for preparation of proposals for the second round, the deadline being September 23rd, 1966, for approval in November. After this, the Advisory Council developed a state focus for the Fiscal 1968 State Plan Amendment which had to be submitted to Washington by June 30, 1967 and was the basis for selection of proposals for that year. Because of Congressional delay in appropriating the Fiscal 1968 funds, however, the 1968 proposals could not be officially approved until December 8, 1967, leaving many institutions with their proposals hanging in limbo for as long as five months.

These short notices, changes, and delays meant that the State Agency could not plan a smooth flow of work, nor could institutions line up staff and resources without knowing if and when funds would be available.

The lack of lead time and the scarcity of funds also meant that many of the functions which would normally have been built in the program have had to be postponed. These include support from the national office, discretionary federal funds for experimentation, initiation of regional or interstate projects, and communication about Title I programs between the states. Because of these factors, the states have had to operate without much guidance or assistance from the Federal Office, and little communication, with the result that useful information has not been widely shared. Stronger guidelines to the states concerning their operations would be very helpful. For example, if the guidelines required or strongly advised a full time state staff for the Title I program, this probably would have to be done in most states and performance would most likely have been improved. Even within the limitations of the present level of appropriation, more clarification of objectives and procedures from the U. S. Office of Education, and more feedback from other Title I programs around the country would be relatively inexpensive and very useful to the State's Title I program.

Present Status

The status of the Title I program in Massachusetts is respectable but undistinguished. The State has participated for three years and has sponsored projects which have given valuable service and have been useful in focusing the attention of institutions of higher education on the problems of their communities. The Table on the following page summarizes data on the program up to the present time.

Table 1

Summary Statistics on Title I, HEA 1965, for Fiscal Years 1966-1968, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

	1966	1967	1968
Proposals submitted	69	68	29*
Proposals funded	20	16	10
Institutions submitting proposals	26	25	21
Institutions receiving grants	16	12	10
Institutions receiving first grants	16	7	2
Institutions receiving repeat grants	0	5	7
Private institutions submitting proposals	21	16	11
Private institutions receiving grants	11	8	6
Public institutions submitting proposals	5	9	9
Public institutions receiving grants	5	4	3

NOTE: For the basic data from which this summary Table was derived, see Table 3, page 56, and Table 4, page 57. Of the 166 proposals submitted between 1966 and 1968, 46 were funded from 25 different institutions. Four of the 46 were refunded and one institution received a supplemental grant.

Additional insights into the present status of the Massachusetts program are provided in a nation-wide study of Title I. Five states, including Massachusetts, were selected for intensive study by a private research organization, Greenleigh Associates.

The Greenleigh Survey, published in August 1967, studied the first two years' program in Massachusetts and pointed up several deficiencies, including:

1. The lack of relationship and communication with other Massachusetts state agencies and the lack of participation by the State Agency in overall planning in the state.
2. Lack of a full time director.
3. Tension between public and private, large and small, and academic and non-academic interests, along with resistance to giving up prerogatives possessed by the separate and autonomous participating institutions.

This study also reported strengths in the program, including the efforts at involving the community, the joint projects sponsored by different institutions, and growing sensitivity in the Title I Advisory Council to the need for further clarification of objectives and for fostering cooperation among academic groups, and between them and community agencies.

Since the Greenleigh Report was completed, Massachusetts has taken some important steps, including evaluation of its projects by an outside agency. The OSTI report, prepared for this purpose, was a useful first step toward the goal of continuing appraisal for all projects funded. Some of the results of the OSTI report will be discussed in Chapter V, "The State Plan".

The 1968 State Plan, focusing on the broad area of problems in local government, is another way in which the State Agency has provided leadership for institutions of higher education. By narrowing the range of projects to those which relate in some way to the functioning of their local governments, the plan has enabled institutions of higher education to concentrate their attention and their resources on one important area. This makes it possible to expect more impact from the Title I program in this area and, since it is a concern shared by almost all the other states, it is possible that results from this focus will be felt nationally as well as within the state.

Conclusions

In Massachusetts today, the ingredients exist for a program of continuing education and community service which would be outstanding in the nation. Talent abounds. The need is obvious and actue. Financial resources are obtainable. What is needed to put these elements together into an effective program is initiative by the State Agency. Initiative is required in surveying the problems and putting together a long-range state-wide plan; in involving the institutions of higher education and community agencies in the development of the plan; in establishing the priorities and developing evaluation procedures; and in making periodic re-appraisal and revision of the plan.

At a minimum, it is the function of the State Agency to stimulate the development of programs in problem areas which need more concentrated efforts, to interpret the regulations and guidelines to the participating institutions, and to analyze and communicate information which is relevant to the program, especially project results and research findings.

The State Agency must also exercise initiative in devising and organizing the mechanisms necessary for its own effective operation, including its staff functions, the role of the Title I Advisory Council, and its relations with other agencies and institutions.

Most of all, Title I needs a solid commitment from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that the state will provide basic support for the program in terms of money, facilities and staff resources.

Looking beyond Massachusetts, it is hoped that the recommendations made by the National Advisory Council in its Second Annual Report will be acted upon.[1] If this were done there would be larger appropriations for Title I, with discretionary funds for experimental projects and for regional or interstate projects. There would also be more staff for providing service to the states and for conducting research and evaluation activities. The National Council has also recommended that appropriations be made for the year following the present Fiscal Year, and that they be for at least a two year period, to allow for a more orderly sequence in the submission, acceptance and funding of proposals.

Recommendations

Based on the preceding historical considerations, evaluations, and personal observations on the progress of the Title I program, the following recommendations are made by the author for the Title I program in Massachusetts. They will be reported and discussed in greater detail in the sections which follow on the State Agency, the State Plan, and the State Advisory Council.

---

[1] These recommendations are presented more fully in Chapter II, "Directions of the Title I Program".

1. That the commissioners of HEFC establish a committee to review the Title I program in Massachusetts. Specifically the committee should determine the desirability of designating the Board of Higher Education as the State Agency. (See Chapter IV, "The State Agency").

2. That a full-time director and assistant be appointed to deal exclusively with the Title I program. Their duties would be to administer the State Agency and State Plan as described in Chapters III, IV and V.

3. That the State Agency actively seek funds from state and local sources for the purpose of supplementing the matching funds required of the institutions of higher education, thereby making possible wider participation in the program.

4. That the State Agency contract to an institution, organization or individual the task of determining the most effective means for surveying the resources available in the institutions of higher education for community problem solving related to the State Plan focus, Local Government. (See Chapter VII, "The Development of a Focus for the State Plan").

5. That the State Agency develop mechanisms for evaluating proposals on a continuing basis, in terms of the state's priorities for Title I programs, and in the context of national priorities established by the National Advisory Council. Specifically, a committee on evaluation should be established. The Committee's function would be to specify the criteria for evaluation (reference to the OSTI report would be useful) and to contract for the services of three or four persons to carry out evaluations of the projects. The evaluation teams would submit their reports to the committee which would, in turn, submit a committee report to the Title I Advisory Council. Ideally, the evaluation team would include representatives from the field of continuing education and the community.

6. That the State Agency initiate contacts with State Agencies in adjoining states to explore the possibility of developing regional projects across state borders that relate to high priority problems.

7. That a consortium of universities be established to:

    a. determine which aspects of local government problems (the State Plan focus) are most acute.

    b. to suggest specific programs to solve these problems, and

c. to prepare educational materials and programs to inform others of the nature of the problems and their possible solutions.

The State Agency would then work with the consortium on Local Government to stimulate other institutions, organizations and agencies to participate in programs to solve the problems identified. (See Chapter VII, "Developing Innovative and Experimental Programs").

8. That the state set up workshops, conferences, consultations, a newsletter and other appropriate communications devices, which would be helpful to the institutions of higher education and project directors in developing and carrying on their projects. Specifically, the State Agency should arrange immediately for an institution of higher education to sponsor an "Institute for Community Service Programming" for continuing education personnel to be held in the Fall of 1968. (See Appendix G for a description of the Syracuse University Institute).

9. That the Massachusetts State Agency should invite the U. S. Office of Education to test the national classification and evaluation procedures in this State on a pilot project basis. Further, that Massachusetts work with the U. S. Office of Education in the development of demonstration projects to be funded by discretionary funds of the commissioner of the U. S. Office of Education, should they become available. (See Chapter II, "Directions of the Title I Programs", National Directions).

CHAPTER II

DIRECTIONS OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM

National Directions

During the preparation of this report, the author had access to the data being collected by the U. S. Office of Education for the National Advisory Council, and to background information about Title I from a variety of sources, including several other states.

While the recommendations for Massachusetts stated in Chapter I of this paper were formulated before the author read the Second Annual Report of the National Advisory Council, it was gratifying to him to find himself in agreement with the Council on its recommendations.

Because Title I is a cooperative program, with responsibility shared by the National office, the State Agency and the local communities and institutions, it is important to capitalize upon the advantages this kind of partnership offers. This can be done by building a state program which meshes gears effectively with the federal program, and in state planning, takes into account the plans and prospects for the program nationally.

At the moment Title I is affected by the fund drought in Washington. Originally conceived as a program which would be introduced at a spending rate of $50 million a year, and authorized to be funded at that level, it has been limited by appropriations to one-fifth of that amount. Furthermore, no discretionary funds were allocated to the Commissioner of Education for innovative approaches or experimental programs, although the Act proposed by the House Education Committee provided for twenty percent of the Title I funds to be reserved for that purpose.

Present efforts under Title I are necessarily modest. However, the favorable reception Title I has received in the States and the encouraging progress made toward solving community problems by projects developed under Title I grants lead to the conclusion that this program will be continued and expanded in the years ahead.

Recommendations of the National Advisory Council

Because they are relevant to the recommendations made by the author in Chapter I of this report, the recommendations made by the National Advisory Committee in its Second Annual Report are presented below, with comments by the Council.

1. The appropriations for the program sponsored under Title I should be increased above the level of $10 million provided in each fiscal year to date.

   The Council believes that the present level of appropriation is inconsistent with the intent and potential of Title I as expressed by Congress in 1965. As a dynamic resource in meeting our critical urban problems, the program should be funded to the maximum feasible amount.

2. Ten percent of the enlarged appropriation for Title I should be set aside for use by the Commissioner to make grants for national or regional demonstration projects.

3. Title I should be amended to authorize a special, additional appropriation for grants to institutions of higher education for major urban community service and continuing education programs.

   The grants would be made by the Commissioner to aid universities to conduct research, planning, and program operation in connection with the efforts of cities to solve the multiple complex problems associated with rapid urbanization and technological and social change. Project grants would provide opportunity for a relatively few large and well focused projects.

   Demonstration projects under urban grants could show the impact of greater funding in making available to the city the resources of higher educational institutions and would be especially useful in implementing the Model Cities programs.

4. A full-time director with a technical and professional staff should be assigned to the Advisory Council if it is to discharge its responsibilities to the President and the Congress.

5. More funds should be assigned to the Division of Adult Education to enable it to add adequate professional and technical staff in the Washington office so that the responsibilities of the Division can be effectively accomplished.

6. The federal officials who administer the Title I program should strongly encourage the State Agencies to provide at least a minimum of one full-time professional person (or the equivalent) in each state.

   An independent study of program effectiveness has reported that such a provision is essential for maximum program effectiveness.

7. The authorization of funds should be extended for the next five fiscal years.

   Because the program is new and its scope of activities has been limited by the level of federal funding, this change would provide a better experience for measuring progress.

8. The 75% federal - 25% non-federal matching requirements should be maintained for the next two years.

9. Appropriations for grants, contracts, or other payments under federally-funded programs for community service and continuing education should be included in the appropriation act for the fiscal year preceding that for which they are available for obligation.

   If institutions of higher learning are to assign the necessary resources to operate effectively they will need assurance that significant programs will be adequately funded over a reasonable period of time.

10. Following the same general logic as that used in the preceding recommendation, Title I of The Higher Education Act of 1965 should be amended to provide for appropriations on a two-year basis.[1]

11. A thorough study of the indirect costs required for various programs of community service and continuing education should be made and a uniform indirect cost policy established consistent with the results of this study.

Additional Plans of the National Advisory Council

In addition to the items specifically recommended, the National Advisory Council is hoping to undertake joint projects using Title I funds and funds available under other legislation, such as the Housing Act, and coordinating projects funded under other federal programs. It might be possible, for example, to establish urban research centers in cooperation with the Model Cities Program. The Council also plans to provide a continuous flow of information between programs to insure coordinated planning.

---

[1] The two preceding recommendations are similar to recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, in its Study of the U. S. Office of Education, November, 1967. Commissioner Harold Howe testified at the hearings held for that report . . . "it seems to me essential to look for appropriations practices which would prevent relationships with States and Communities from being regularly conducted on a crisis basis".

The National Advisory Council report also goes into some detail about its plans for identifying problems and establishing priorities for dealing with them. It is also developing a system of criteria for appraisal of programs. It plans to use all these instruments in putting together the comprehensive, coordinated, long-range plan for community service and continuing education programs which the legislation calls for.

These recommendations and plans suggest that the Title I Program will be continued and expanded, and that long-range funding will eventually be made possible. Additional grants will be available for experimental programs and for programs designed to meet the needs for community service and continuing education in the urban areas.

With this national situation in mind, the following section looks at the Title I program in Massachusetts to date, and suggest directions for the State's activities in the years ahead.

Directions for Title I in Massachusetts

Comparing Massachusetts with four other state programs in its Five State Survey, the Greenleigh Report states that in essence the effect of Title I in Massachusetts, as in the other states studied, has been threefold:

1. To help the State to begin to survey its problems and resources.

2. To stimulate interest on the part of professionals and community agencies in using continuing education programs for solving community problems.

3. To aid individuals and institutions in planning for inter-institutional efforts.

The Greenleigh Report further notes that in its first two years Title I enabled institutions to implement existing program ideas, and in some cases to attempt new ventures. The funding of proposals, however, did not concentrate efforts on any one problem area or group of problems, but rather diffused the resources within the states, capitalizing upon areas of known or proven capabilities among academic institutions, rather than encouraging and supporting situations in need of development and strengthening.

The author agrees with the Greenleigh Report that up to this point the Title I program does not seem to have had the effect of stimulating universities to survey their own resources and to organize for attacks on community problems in a systematic way.

Title I seems rather to have provided funds for already existing program ideas and projects which had been delayed because of lack of money. In fact, the first proposals received for Fiscal 1966 contained several which had been rejected by other funding agencies and then submitted to Title I for funding. However, the author would point out that projects such as Boston University's 1966 Metropolitan Education Project have attempted to determine the resources available for community problem solving, and some of the later projects are cooperative ventures between institutions. These included:

1. A cooperative project involving Clark University, Assumption College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute and the State College of Worcester. The objective is to set up a Center for Community

Studies, involving the leadership and staff of the major social agencies of the Worcester area.

2. Massasoit Community College and Stonehill College jointly sponsored two programs.
    a) A police training seminar.
    b) An economic development and regional planning project.

3. Boston College and the University of Massachusetts together sponsored a joint project to prepare a guide on the new Home Rule Amendment for communities in the state, and also to hold a television assembly to instruct in the use of this guide.

These projects seem to the author to be encouraging evidence of the potential of the Title I program to develop cooperative relationships among public and private universities and other agencies serving the community. Further, a number of projects, including the Massasoit-Stonehill project in economic and regional planning, the 1966 programs fielded by Bridgewater State College on water pollution, Dean Junior College's Municipal Research Bureau, and the University of Massachusetts project in environmental pollution, succeeded in bringing together a number of individuals and agencies from different communities in order to work together on problems which affected them all.

The Greenleigh study also noted that there is no evidence that the state government has systematically tried to involve the universities on a state-wide basis in community problems prior to the Title I program. Rather, the pattern has been that universities have individually taken on specific projects from time to time, and individuals within the academic institutions have been engaged with regard to specific governmental problems.

Indeed, until the State Agency was established under Title I, there was no formal structure through which university resources might be identified, mobilized and used with regard to community problem solving and no other structure for state-wide, long-range planning and coordination. The author concludes that the Title I agency, therefore, fills an important need in this area, and its efforts toward identifying problems and setting priorities are encouraging signs of progress toward arriving at a comprehensive, coordinated plan.

Another indication of interest in coordinating activities in Massachusetts is that in recent weeks Governor Volpe has proposed to the Massachusetts Legislature the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, into which would go the Division of Housing, the Division of Urban Affairs and the Bureau of Relocation - all now in the State Department of Commerce and Development. The Governor stated that the principal functions of the new department would be to:

- "Provide assistance to communities in solving local problems and act as a clearing-house for information, data, and other materials useful for local governments and regional agencies.
-

- "Coordinate through advice and counsel those programs of other state agencies designed to assist in the solution of local problems.
- "Assist local governments in their relations with state and federal agencies and programs.
- "Carry out studies and analyses which will aid in solving local and regional problems and advise and inform the Governor and the Legislature on the affairs and problems of local government.
- "Encourage and assist local governments to cooperate in seeking mutual solutions to common problems.
- "Participate, upon request of any community, in any matters involving an agency of the commonwealth which affect such community.
- "Take full advantage, and assist other state and local agencies in taking full advantage, of federal grants available for community development, and act on behalf of the commonwealth in connection with such grants."

Should the Massachusetts Legislature establish this department the effectiveness of the Title I program might be greatly increased, because the Title I State Agency could rely on the Department of Urban Affairs to carry out many of the data gathering and coordinating functions that it presently is expected to do. Being relieved of such tasks, the State Agency could then concentrate its efforts on working with the institutions of higher education to develop their resources and relate their efforts to other agencies and organizations throughout Massachusetts.

The Relation of Future Directions of Title I in Massachusetts to Federal Activities.

Future prospects for federal activities suggest that the State Plan must begin to stress the following activities:

1. Preparation of program plans for urban areas which are to be supported by new funds specifically allocated for such areas.
2. The development of innovative programs and experimental approaches to community problems.
3. Development of projects undertaken jointly with other states to deal with interstate problems.

For the three categories of programs suggested above there is the prospect of more funds being appropriated. The impact of the state's efforts can be increased by the additional federal money if the state prepares to take advantage of the funds which may be available beyond the regular state allocations.

Some of the new programs, for example the urban grants, are proposed for funding on a 90% federal to 10% local ratio, which will make them especially attractive and valuable in increasing the resources available in the state. These funds can be put to use immediately by institutions which have the commitment, competence and resources to bring to bear on community problems, and they could also be used to assist less able institutions in the development of their resources for community problem solving. This funding device seems especially appropriate for strengthening the resources of the institutions for attacking problems in areas of critical need.

The State Agency and the State Plan should also take into account the data developed by the National Advisory Council, particularly with regard to evaluation and effectiveness, and they should also be alert to the possible implementation of findings from experimental projects in our own and other areas.

The resources of the National Advisory Council can be helpful to Title I in Massachusetts, and increase the impact of the program within the state and the region, but the State Agency must exercise a great deal of initiative if the Title I program in Massachusetts is to achieve the maximum benefit in service to its communities. Specific suggestions for the activities of the State Agency and the State Advisory Council are presented in the two chapters which follow.

CHAPTER III

THE STATE AGENCY IN MASSACHUSETTS

Federal Requirements for the Administration of the State Agency.

Federal regulations require that a State Agency shall be established to develop, submit, administer and/or supervise the administration of a State Plan. It is also required that the annual program plan submission shall contain a statement describing the specific aspects of a comprehensive, coordinated and state-wide system of continuing education and community service programs for which financial assistance is requested, the basis for the selection of the community service programs, and the description of the method followed by the State Agency in determining the community problems or aspects thereof to be solved.

Massachusetts has met the requirements of the Act regarding the development, submission and administration of the State Plan. Developing a plan for a comprehensive, coordinated and state-wide system of community service programs has not yet been accomplished, although a great deal of thought and effort has been invested in this task.

The Establishment of the State Agency

In Massachusetts many individuals and organizations were watching the progress of the Higher Education Act as it moved through the Congress in 1965. When it was passed there was a great deal of discussion about selecting the most appropriate base from which it might be conducted. A number of agencies were suggested, among them the newly formed State Board of Higher Education and the University of Massachusetts.

At the time it was not thought practical to designate the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, since it had only recently been created by the Legislature, and was not yet functioning to fulfill its legally defined responsibilities. There also were objections to designating the University of Massachusetts. Since this state has so many private institutions of higher education it was felt unwise to assign the administration of the Title I program to a state university.

The Higher Education Facilities Commission (HEFC) had been in existence for more than a year when the Title I appropriation became available, and since the Commission members had been selected to represent a cross section of the public and private institutions of higher education in the state, it met the federal requirements of representativeness. Also, the Commission members and staff had worked effectively in the administration of other federal funds in amounts greatly exceeding the Title I allocation.

The Commission members discussed the Title I legislation at their meetings and agreed that they could accept responsibility for administering it. In the exercise of responsible civic leadership, the HEFC director was authorized to suggest to the Governor that HEFC be designated as the Title I State Agency in order that Massachusetts would qualify to participate in the program. The Governor agreed and the HEFC was so designated on February 23, 1966.

The Performance of the State Agency

While the initiative shown by HEFC was essential for getting Title I started in Massachusetts, there have been serious difficulties with it as the State Agency.

First of these is the question of funding. Since HEFC is a federal agency operating under federal funds, the administrative costs of its operation cannot be used as a contribution for the local matching requirements. In effect, this meant that the $25,000 permissible for administration could not be released. This restriction made it necessary to ask participating institutions to add an additional percentage to their share of the matching requirement. This round-about method of providing funds for the administration of an important program caused great delay, inconvenience and embarrassment. It also may have discouraged some of the poorer institutions from participating in the program.

Another concern is the matter of shared directorship. The Title I program was added to the already existing responsibilities of the HEFC director, with the result that the program has been administered as a part-time effort. It is the conclusion of the author that for obvious, practical reasons, Title I is given a lower priority by the Commission and its staff than the other funded programs for which HEFC was originally established. Discussion with other states and with Washington administrators leaves little doubt that having a full-time director contributes greatly to the success of the program in other states. Title I in Massachusetts needs a full-time director and staff in order to carry out the intent of the legislation and the expanded responsibilities which this report recommends.

Third is the problem of continuity of staffing. Since the Title I legislation was enacted there have been three directors at the HEFC. While staff changes are to be expected, and the uncertainties of funding contribute to turnover, it would be wise to establish a position that would attract and hold a person professionally committed to continuing education and community service.

Fourth is the question of money. HEFC is a federal agency and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has so far made no commitment of funds to Title I. It would be reasonable, in view of the benefits to the state from Title I, for the state to commit funds for the program, as other states, such as our neighbors Connecticut and New York have done. The state should appropriate money to supplement the matching funds contributed by the institutions of higher education, especially since the matching requirement is now fifty percent, making it very difficult for the impecunious institutions to participate.

The View of the National Advisory Council on the Role of the State Agency

The National Advisory Council has also addressed itself to these problems, and described the results of its deliberations in the section titled "The Development of a Long-Range Plan", in its Second Annual Report. The Council concluded that the task is one which can be perfected only over a series of years of work, and suggested a number of steps which should be taken to arrive at this goal. The National Plan and program priorities obviously have implications for the State Plan and priorities, and they must therefore work closely together for the most effective results from the program.

The National Council described the relationship between the federal and state agencies in this way . . . "the federal role is to provide funds, direct attention to national goals and problems, organize technical assistance, provide a national focus on program needs, coordinate relationships with other national programs, and monitor state commissions and agencies. The state's role is to determine state priorities in relation to national problems, create program systems, grant and distribute funds, provide technical assistance to institutions, promote inter-institutional cooperation, help develop state resources to supplement and match federal funds, and bring educational institutions and the community together on a state-wide basis. Within this decentralized system, educational institutions develop programs which relate to a local or state manifestation of problems, secure or use the required resources, operate specific programs, and develop or enhance relationships with the community and with program participants.

"The essential characteristic of the decentralized approach is that many key functions must be shared. Decision making is not centered exclusively at a particular point, as it is in a hierarchical administrative system. Planning, the determination of objectives, the distribution of funds, and the evaluation of effectiveness occur at each level, and responsibility for all four is to some extent jointly shared. Persuasive leadership, organizational flexibility, and clear communication processes, which are always important, become crucial when a decentralized approach is used to support higher education. On each level, organizations must be aware of what others are doing. Programs must simultaneously be responsive to local needs, to state issues, and to federal problem categories.

"Successful administration requires that programs on each level squarely meet their responsibilities. Yet success cannot be compelled or exacted. The states must seriously engage in problem identification and planning, and institutions need to make strong and continuing commitments to community involvement.

"There is another reason why considerable initiative must be exercised locally and regionally in these programs. As noted earlier, the problems to whose solution they are directed are not simple. They are consequences of highly complex social, political and technological processes that require a high level of understanding. Factors affecting them are rooted in many different places throughout society, and often individual or local action to resolve them is neither practical nor possible. The universities have unique resources to analyze these problems and to help achieve solutions."

The author's experience with the Massachusetts Advisory Council leads him to believe that the members agree with this view of the appropriate role for the State Agency. They feel that the Agency should be much more active in developing resources and providing leadership to the institutions of higher education in their efforts to work toward the solution of community problems. Plans for some of these activities have already been made, and could be implemented by the Agency with resulting benefits to the State Program.

The Author's View

The State Agency is crucial to the success of the Title I effort. Neither the Federal Government nor the individual institutions of higher education can or should be the agency to mobilize the resources for community problem solving under this legislation. The State Agency must assert itself as the central planning, coordinating, educating and mobilizing agency within the state, as described by the National Advisory Council. It has the mandate, the money and the position necessary to do the job.

In his experience in working with the Title I program, and in the discussions with others involved with the program, the author has found no opposition to this view. All concerned agree that there should be a strong State Agency which would energetically pursue a program of activities as described above.

Why then, has this not happened? Why have not the decisions been made that would strengthen the agency and its staff?

The main problem seems to be that not enough people see the relevance and potential of the Title I legislation to their particular interests. There are several reasons for this:

1. The purposes of Title I are not sufficiently clear for people to see how they are related to them.

2. Very few people outside of the institutions of higher education and the Federal Government even know of the legislation.

3. Even those who have heard of the program have not been drawn to it because it has not highlighted critical social and political problems with which they have been concerned - it is not seen as providing immediate solutions to serious community problems.

4. The legislation does not designate a specific individual, group or unit within the institutions of higher education to develop and administer the Title I program and consequently no institutional representatives such as continuing education personnel feel responsible for it.

5. The sum of money available to date has been small and has not attracted the interest of major institutions, most of whom are already involved with scores of other Federal and State programs.

Given this state of affairs, who should take responsibility for improving the program, and what are the prospects that they will do so?

First, the institutions of higher education should involve themselves more effectively, particularly through their continuing education personnel, who could serve on task forces and committees, and provide badly needed manpower. However, even though they have the most to gain in future support for their programs, there is nothing to indicate that they will take the initiative and organize for action of this kind. The history of cooperative activity in behalf of the field of higher continuing education in Massachusetts is one of indifference.

Second, the staff of the Agency could undertake the job of building a more effective program, since they have the responsibility of administering the program. However, because Title I has a lower priority at the Commission than other programs, it is unlikely that the staff will be able to devote the time and energy necessary for the expanded functions recommended by the author.

Third, the State Agency Title I Advisory Council has been delegated the responsibility for making improvements. It is their task to advise the Commissioners of HEFC on the operation of the program. However, the Council's effectiveness has been limited, both as a whole and in sub-committees. Attendance at meetings has been sporadic, and while sufficient to accomplish the basic task of reviewing and recommending proposals for funding, it has had to rely on the staff for the development of the program.

As Title I now exists, none of the three groups mentioned can be expected to take major initiative for changing the structure, nor improving and expanding the administration of the program. This leaves the Commissioners of the Higher Education Facilities Commission to deal with the question of the future of Title I. Because of their interest in this program, and because of their past record of taking initiative in behalf of Title I in this state, the author suggests that HEFC again take the leadership role in establishing a reorganized and more effective State Agency.

The author recommends that the Commissioners of HEFC appoint a sub-committee to review the Title I program to date and to make recommendations for future action.

Specifically, the sub-committee should address itself to the two major recommendations of this report:

1. That the Board of Higher Education be considered as the officially designated State Agency for Title I in Massachusetts.

2. That a full-time director, professionally qualified in the field of higher continuing education, be hired to administer the program.

The reasons for suggesting the possibility of designating the BHE as the State Agency are as follows:

1. The Board of Higher Education was established to develop and coordinate a comprehensive system of public higher education. It was specifically charged with establishing and maintaining university extension courses and although it has not conducted such programs itself it has taken the following action related to continuing education:

a. A Task Force on University Extension and Continuing Education was established and subsequently submitted to the Board a report with recommendations for future action by public institutions.

b. A permanent Advisory Committee on Continuing Education has been established to assist the Board of Higher Education to develop policy and plans for continuing education.

c. New positions to develop and administer continuing education activities were requested in the supplementary budget of the Board of Higher Education for 1967-68 and in the regular budget for 1968-69. Although funds for the position were not included in the 1969 budget, the Board of Higher Education's table of organization includes such positions which will be filled as soon as budget approval is obtained.

More broadly speaking, the Board of Higher Education is planning a comprehensive program of higher education that includes both public and private institutions. These studies and related activities of the Board underline its concern for both public and private institutions and its planning reflects this broad viewpoint. "Such planning", the 1967 Annual Report of the Board states, "must take into account the present status and potential for the future of the private institutions of higher education as well as the public institutions and should aim towards cooperation and complementation rather than conflict and unnecessary competition between the public and private institutions".

The Higher Education Facilities Commission, on the other hand, was never intended by the Legislature to have the responsibility for state-wide, comprehensive planning in the area of continuing education and community service and therefore has never attempted to fulfill this function.

2. The Advisory Committee on Continuing Education of the Board of Higher Education, which is primarily concerned with the education of adults in the State at the college level, is apparently willing to undertake the responsibility for the Title I program.

3. The Board of Higher Education, with some funds from HEFC, is at present conducting research on topics which are very similar to the interest of the Title I program, particularly the study of Higher Education in the Metropolitan Area. Special attention is being given to the possibilities of inter-institutional cooperation and to the relation of public institutions of higher education to each other and to the community. It has been proposed that this study serve as a pilot for similar studies in other areas such as the Merrimack Valley and Essex County.

4. Among the agencies designated by the states and territories to administer Title I, only three others, (Kansas, North Dakota and South Dakota) have designated their Higher Education Facilities Commissions. Of the other states and territories, twenty-four have designated a variety of existing agencies of state government, fourteen of these appear to be similar to the Board of Higher Education. Twenty-six states have designated state universities as their official agency.

For these reasons, it seems to the author that the goals of the program might be more effectively implemented if the Board of Higher Education were named the State Agency. However, because the author has not thoroughly investigated the desirability of such a change he can only strongly urge that such an investigation be made. In any case, the matter should be discussed at the earliest moment possible so that the program for Fiscal 1969 can benefit from the services provided by a stronger State Agency, wherever it may be located.

CHAPTER IV

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

While the National Advisory Council was required by the Title I legislation, the states were not specifically directed to appoint advisory councils. Instead they were required to designate agencies whose membership included individuals having special qualifications or experience in working with and solving community problems, and who are broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the state. Other agencies could be designated if the state took action to assure that they met the same requirements, or if the state appointed an advisory council to fulfill these requirements. This council would consult with the State Agency on the preparation of the State Plan and any amendments, or on policy matters arising from the administration of the Plan.

Most of the states and territories did appoint advisory councils, even though they were not mandatory in all cases. In Massachusetts, for example, the Higher Education Facilities Commission members fulfilled the requirements of the Act, being representative of the institutions of higher education and being qualified and experienced in working with community problems. An advisory council therefore was not mandatory. However, it was felt that the Advisory Council, appointed especially to advise and consult on Title I, and having more representatives from continuing education and from the community, would add strength to the program. For these reasons, HEFC appointed a committee to nominate members for the Advisory Council, and on February 23, 1966 these nominees were appointed by Governor Volpe to the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Title I Programs of Continuing Education and Community Service.

Because Title I of the Higher Education Act is not specific in defining the composition and functions of the state advisory councils, each state has wide latitude for defining the role of its council and for making optimum use of its resources. The Massachusetts Title I Advisory Council is aware of the possibilities existing in this broadly defined responsibility and has held discussions of its own role, activities and procedures. A preliminary report on these discussions under the title "Policies and Procedures for the Advisory Council and its Sub-Committees Under Title I (HEA 1965)" is included as Appendix D. Some of the history of the activities of the Advisory Council are described in the following paragraphs.

In the first phase of its existence the Massachusetts Advisory Council was engaged largely in the selection of projects and the disbursement of funds on as reasonable and productive a basis as possible. This was due to the circumstances in which the program began to function, mostly having to do with the time limitations.

After funding two annual sets of programs (for Fiscal 1966 and Fiscal 1967), the Advisory Council was able to turn its attention to consideration of the most effective directions to be taken by the Title I program in the future in order to carry out its responsibility for developing a comprehensive and coordinated state-wide program of continuing education and community service.

The most immediate concern was for the Fiscal 1968 Amendment, which would be the basis for funding proposals for the third year of the program. The scarcity of funds made it imperative to use them in the most effective possible way. The Advisory Council therefore decided that the 1968 State Plan should focus its funding on one broad problem area, that of local government. It was felt that more concentrated work in one area of vital concern would show more cumulative results. For a more detailed discussion of the selection of the Fiscal 1968 focus, see Chapter VI, "Development of a Focus for the State Plan".

Now that the initial obligations of funding programs and defining the area of activity for the next year have been met, the Advisory Council is able to consider its own activities, and to define for itself a strucutre which will be most effective in reaching its goals.

Future Tasks for the Advisory Council

The task for the Council in the states is very similar to that of the National Advisory Council for the entire program, namely, to develop the comprehensive and coordinated program which is required by the regulations; to set priorities for the selection of projects; to set directions for the state program; to consult with the state agency in matters of policy; and to act as a resource and as a liaison with the community for Title I, developing relationships with government and community agencies and meeting with the public in representing Title I programs.

This definition of the responsibilities of the Advisory Council has been developed out of the experience of the past two years. In order to discharge the responsibilities, the following improvements should be made.

The structure and composition of the Advisory Council should be reviewed. It might in fact have fewer members, but the distribution should be weighted more heavily in favor of community representation. In addition, the Council should have a number of subcommittees whose members would address themselves to specific tasks, and who might not all need to be members of the Council. This appointment of sub-committees was recommended in a resolution passed by the Council more than a year ago, but it has not as yet been implemented. Some of the tasks for which sub-committees might be responsible are listed below:

a. A selection sub-committee would be responsible for establishing and implementing procedures for funding proposals.

b. A State Plan Amendment sub-committee would have the responsibility for developing the annual Amendment to the State Plan.

c. A sub-committee on resources development could be responsible for surveys of the present resources for community service at institutions of higher education. It could also assist the institutions in planning for the effective use and further development of these resources.

d. A sub-committee on evaluation could set up procedures for maintaining a continuous check on the Title I projects, furnishing periodic evaluations to the Council.

With special committees to work on these specific tasks, the Title I Advisory Council could be free to function in a truly advisory capacity. The members would be able to keep in touch with the work of the sub-committees, and in light of their findings could recommend action and policy to the State Agency.

If the work load were distributed in this way, the Council could dispose of its obligations and also review its own role and activities at meetings held for one day every two or three months. With full time staff serving the State Agency there could be improved advance staff work, which would make it possible for the meetings to be held more expeditiously. The members of the Council would also be better prepared for their policy advisory role. In addition, more representation from the community would make for better balance of the interests represented at the meetings, a more comprehensive consideration of the issues involved in the Title I activities, and greater liaison between Title I and community agencies and organizations.

These improvements in operation would probably result in greater accomplishment, which would make Council membership more satisfying, and lead to greater commitment on the part of the Advisory Council members.

CHAPTER V

THE STATE PLAN - MASSACHUSETTS

The provisions of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 require that each state develop a comprehensive, coordinated, state-wide plan for the implementation of the Act, and to set forth policies, methods and procedures to be followed in order to participate in the federal program. A program must be submitted annually as an amendment to the original plan, and these amendments are the basis for approval of individual Title I projects by the Commissioner of Education.

Even before the State Agency in Massachusetts was designated, a number of individuals were interested in the development of the State Plan, and concerned about how they could contribute to a successful Title I program in the state. On January 25, 1966, a group of educators met at the New England Board of Higher Education to discuss the development and operation of a Massachusetts State Plan for the administration of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. They developed broad guidelines which they felt would be desirable for the development and administration of the State Plan, and these guidelines were made available for the consideration of the subsequently designated State Agency. The report of this meeting is included in this report as Appendix E.

The group that met felt that the State Plan should be focused on community needs and community problems rather than on educational institutions, and suggested the criteria by which the Advisory Committee might be chosen.

They recommended that the Committee begin its work by gathering information about community problems and about the educational resources of the state, and should appoint task forces to make more detailed surveys of research and action programs in specific areas which were determined to be of high priority. Also suggested were procedures for soliciting and selecting proposals, and for evaluating proposals.

The group was of the opinion that the task of developing the comprehensive, coordinated and state-wide plan could not be completed within a few months, so that those problems which seemed most urgent be attacked first, with the understanding that the program might be changed as re-evaluation and further study continued. They also recommended that some of the Title I funds be used for research, and for innovative programs of special promise.

The recommendations of this group were made available to the State Agency when it was designated, but the pressure to get proposals funded within the time limits set for the Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967 precluded the possibility of acting on many of these suggestions, which still seem valid after two years experience with the program.

The first State Plan in Massachusetts (Fiscal 1966) was put together after the proposals were funded, and was essentially built around them. As required by the Act, all the qualifying institutions of higher education in the state, a total of 88, were invited to submit proposals. Sixty-nine proposals were received from 26 institutions, and twenty proposals, received from 16 institutions, were funded. Of these institutions, eleven were private, the others public.

The problems dealt with in the proposals were classified under the following general headings:

1. Special problems of the Urban Setting
2. Raising the Educational Potential of the Disadvantaged
3. Problems of Improving Educational Techniques and Content for Specialized Groups

4. Problems of Employment and Underemployment
5. Problems of Municipal Administration and the Community Economy
6. Problems of Community Health and Recreation
7. Problems of Regional Planning

The proposals were selected mainly on the basis of their apparent relative merits in the judgment of the selection committed. The criteria for judgment included the following considerations:

1. Judgment of the Selection Committee members as to the capability of the institution.
2. Judgment of the Selection Committee as to the ability and involvement of the project staff.
3. Balance between public and private, large and small institutions.
4. Geographic distribution.
5. Level of interest stimulated in the Advisory Council members by the proposal.
6. A range of problem areas and proposed amounts of funds.
7. Realistic matching arrangements for funding.
8. Indication that the Title I project might result in greater involvement by the institution in community problems.

9. Indication that the project would tend to develop working relationships between the universities and agencies or individuals in the community.
10. Project to be carried on cooperatively by more than one institution of higher education.
11. Proposals dealing with urgent problems.
12. Projects for which other funds were not available.
13. Proposals which were clearly stated both as to goals and means.

Immediately after the first set of proposals was funded, the qualifying institutions were solicited for their 1967 proposals. This time 92 institutions were invited to apply, of which 25 submitted a total of 68 proposals. Sixteen proposals from twelve institutions received grants.

These proposals were classified in the same way as the Fiscal 1966 proposals, and selected on the basis of the same criteria.

The sponsoring agencies varied from small community colleges to the large urban universities, and included technical and business schools as well as liberal arts colleges. The requests for funds were small during these first two years, with almost two-thirds of the grants amounting to fifteen thousand dollars or less.

After the funding of the Fiscal 1967 proposals, the Advisory Council began to consider the Fiscal 1968 State Plan Amendment. A more detailed description of this amendment, and the development of the focus for the Fiscal 1968 program, are presented in Chapter VI which follows, "The Development of the State Plan Focus".

The narrowing of the range of problem areas under which proposals might be submitted, and an increase in the matching funds requirement to fifty percent, resulted in a drop in the number of applications to 28, from 21 institutions, for Fiscal 1968. Of these, five new projects were funded, along with four requests for re-funding, and one request for supplemental funds. These grants were made to a total of nine institutions. As can be seen from the following Table, the grants for 1968 were smaller in number but larger in size than in previous years.

Table 2

Number of Title I Grants Awarded, by Amount of
Grants, Total Funds Awarded in Grant
Size Categories, and Percentage
in each of Total Funds Granted
for the Year. (1966-1968)

Amount of Grant in Thousands	No.	1966 Total	%	No.	1967 Total	%	No.	1968 Total	%
$ 0- 4,999	5	$16,756	7	7	$26,200	13	1	$ 3,800	2
5- 9,999	7	51,634	23	0	--	--	0	--	--
10-14,999	2	25,290	11	3	38,200	18	3	38,113	20
15-19,999	3	47,381	21	2	33,250	16	2	32,675	18
20-24,999	2	43,050	18	2	44,000	21	1	20,000	11
25-29,999	0	--	--	0	--	--	1	27,774	15
30-34,999	0	--	--	1	30,000	15	2	61,735	34
35-39,999	0	--	--	1	35,000	17	0	--	--
40-44,999	0	--	--	0	--	--	0	--	--
45-49,999	1	45,000	20	0	--	--	0	--	--
Totals	20	229,111	100	16	206,650	100	10	184,097	100

NOTE: Brief descriptions of the individual projects for which grants were made are included as Appendix H.

Tables 3 and 4, which follow, list the institutions submitting Title I proposals between Fiscal 1966 and Fiscal 1968, and the geographical distribution of these institutions by region. As can be seen from these Tables, the Title I grants have been distributed throughout the state, with the largest concentration of projects in the Boston Metropolitan Area.

Table 3

Institutions Submitting Title I Proposals and Receiving Grants, 1966-1968

Institution of Higher Education	1966		1967		1968	
	Grants	Proposals	Grants	Proposals	Grants	Proposals
American Int. Coll.	0	1	0	1	0	0
Assumption	0	1	0	1	0	0
Babson	1	2	2	3	0	0
Boston Arch. Center	0	0	1	2	0	1
Boston College	0	1	2	12	3**	4
Boston University	1	3	2	3	0	1
Brandeis	0	1	0	0	0	1
*Bridgewater	1	1	0	0	0	1
Clark	1	2	1	1	1	1
Dean Junior College	1	1	1	3	1	1
Emmanuel	0	0	0	0	0	1
*Greenfield	1	2	0	2	1	1
Harvard	2	7	0	5	1	1
*Holyoke	0	0	0	2	0	0
Holy Cross	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lesley	0	1	0	0	0	0
*Lowell Tech.	1	1	0	1	0	2
*Massasoit	0	0	1	1	0	1
M. I. T.	1	3	0	3	0	1
Northeastern	2	10	2	8	1	2
*North Shore C. C.	1	3	0	2	0	2
*Northern Essex C.C.	0	0	1	1	0	0
*Quincy	0	0	0	0	0	1
Radcliffe	1	2	0	1	0	0
Regis	0	1	0	0	0	0
*Salem State	0	0	1	2	0	2
Simmons	0	1	0	0	1	1
Springfield College	2	3	0	0	0	0
*Springfield Tech.	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stonehill	0	4	1	1	0	0
Suffolk	0	1	0	3	0	0
Tufts	2	8	0	2	0	0
*Univ. Mass. Amherst	1	6	1	5	1**	2
*Univ. Mass. Boston	0	0	0	0	1	1
Wentworth	1	2	0	0	0	0
Wheelock	0	1	0	0	0	0
*Worcester Polytech.	0	0	0	2	0	0
Total Proposals	20	69	16	68	10	29
Total Institutions	16	26	12	25	9	21

* Indicates public institutions ** A joint project

Table 4

Geographical Distribution of Title I Proposals Funded and Not Funded 1966-1968

	1966		1967		1968	
	Grants	Proposals	Grants	Proposals	Grants	Proposals
BOSTON AREA						
Babson	1	2	2	3	0	0
Boston Arch. Cent.	0	0	1	2	0	0
Boston College	0	1	2	12	3**	4
Boston University	1	3	2	3	0	1
Brandeis	0	1	0	0	0	1
Emmanuel	0	0	0	0	0	1
Harvard	2	7	0	5	1	1
Lesley	0	1	0	0	0	0
M. I. T.	2	3	0	3	0	1
Northeastern	2	10	1	8	1	2
*Quincy	0	0	0	0	0	1
Radcliffe	1	2	0	1	0	0
Regis	0	1	0	0	0	0
Simmons	0	1	0	0	1	1
Suffolk	0	1	0	3	0	0
Tufts	2	8	0	2	0	0
*Univ. Mass. Boston	0	0	0	0	1	1
Wentworth	1	2	0	0	0	0
Wheelock	0	1	0	0	0	0
MID STATE						
Assumption	0	1	0	1	0	0
Clark	1	2	1	1	1	1
Holy Cross	0	0	0	0	0	1
*Worcester Polytech.	0	0	0	2	0	0
WESTERN						
American Int. Coll.	0	1	0	1	0	0
*Greenfield	1	2	0	2	1	1
*Holyoke C. C.	0	0	0	2	0	0
Springfield College	2	3	0	0	0	0
*Springfield Tech.	0	0	0	1	0	0
*Univ. Mass. Amherst	0	0	0	0	1**	2
NORTHEAST						
*Lowell Tech.	1	1	0	1	0	2
*Northern Essex	0	0	1	1	0	0
*North Shore C. C.	1	3	0	2	0	2
*Salem State	0	0	1	2	0	2
SOUTHEAST						
*Bridgewater	1	1	0	0	0	1
Dean	1	1	1	3	1	1
*Massasoit	0	4	1	1	0	0
Stonehill	0	4	1	1	0	0

* Indicates public institutions **Joint project on home rule

The proposals received and the number funded have diminished with each funding period, as have the number of institutions represented in the proposals, even though the amount of funds available has remained the same. The projects funded in Fiscal 1966 and Fiscal 1967 were mostly small; two-thirds were for less than $15,000. In Fiscal 1968 all those funded were over $10,000, except for one supplemental grant of $3,800 for a Fiscal 1966 project.

The proposals received for Fiscal 1968 were the first to be funded in the "local government" category, the focus of the 1968 Amended State Plan, and they were more ambitious projects requesting larger sums of money. For this reason only ten grants were made for Fiscal 1968, four of which were continuations of formerly funded programs and five for new projects.

For Fiscal 1968 applications dropped to 28, from 69 in Fiscal 1966 and 68 in Fiscal 1967. The number of institutions applying also dropped from 26 in 1966 and 25 in 1967 to 21 in 1968, demonstrating the squeeze felt when the matching funds requirement changed to fifty percent from twenty-five percent.

In all, 37 of 92 eligible institutions have submitted Title I proposals. The 1968 total of 21 is less than twenty-five percent of those who might submit proposals if there were more money and if funding were less erratic.

The community services undertaken by the Title I projects in the three years to date fall into the following general categories:

Table 5

Title I Proposals by Categories of Community Service 1966-1968

	1966		1967		1968	
	Funded	Not Funded	Funded	Not Funded	Funded	Not Funded
Community Leadership	5	5	3	4	0	3
Development of the Arts and Recreation	0	2	1	7	0	1
Development of Municipal Govt. and Leadership	3	8	2	4	5	3
Community Problems in Mental and Community Health	1	4	1	6	2	1
Regional Planning and Regional Problems	11	2	1	5	2	3
Community Social Problems	4	6	3	6	1	0
Problems in Urban Renewal and Community Relations	1	6	4	8	0	3
Education Problems and Training in Special Areas	5	16	0	13	0	4
TOTAL	20	49	15	53	10	18

The problems which the proposals sought to alleviate, and the solutions suggested in the proposals are as follows:

PROBLEMS:

Lack of Specific Knowledge

Need for Volunteers and Community Leaders

Need for Intra-Community Cooperation

Need to Disseminate Knowledge

Provide Training for Specific Groups

Need for Regional Cooperation

Need for a Specific Service:

- Consultant
- Money or Equipment
- Expand or Improve present Services
- Study of Demonstration project

Need to Develop Educational Programs for Wider Use

SOLUTIONS:

Seminars or Conferences

Classes

Written or TV Report

Training

Bureaus or Agencies

Study

Service

Meeting the Objectives of the HEA 1965

One of the responsibilities of the State Agency is to try to determine periodically how well it is meeting the objectives of the program as defined in the legislation. In Massachusetts the State Agency has been attempting to meet this responsibility by reviewing reports from the Title I projects; by discussing progress in the meetings of the Advisory Council; and by commissioning an evaluation of the Fiscal 1966 projects by an outside agency. This evaluation is the study mentioned previously which was carried out by the Organization for Social and Technological Innovation of Cambridge, Massachusetts (OSTI). In the course of this investigation the Fiscal 1966 projects were studied during the summer of 1967, and the results were released in November, 1967. OSTI prepared its report to discuss the three major objectives of the legislation, which were:

1. To utlize college and university resources for addressing community problems;
2. To stimulate existing agencies to meet the demand for services more adequately;
3. To stimulate new relationships between institutions of higher education and communities for solving public problems.

With regard to these objectives, the OSTI report concluded that the Massachusetts Title I program had met the first objective of utilizing college and university resources for addressing community problems, but with some reservations:

> "In general, the project directors were most concerned with the relationship of their projects to the community rather than the relationship of the college or university to the community. Few of them saw Title I projects as a means for restructuring and integrating the teaching, research and community service aspects of their institutions. Nevertheless, in some of the colleges, particularly the small ones, Title I projects stimulated new community services."

> "From our field research, we saw few indications that Title I programs were meeting the second national objective - to stimulate existing service agencies to better meet community needs."

With regard to the third objective, OSTI reported ". . .we did find indications that Title I projects were stimulating new relationships between certain colleges and their communities for addressing public problems. These trends were observed in small towns where the colleges were traditionally closely bound to the interests and problems of the communities." The projects at Dean Junior College, North Shore Community College and Greenfield Community College were cited as examples of successful development of new relationships.

OSTI also reported the development of another kind of relationship, namely that between a variety of administrative bodies, as in the "Colloquium on Human Relations and the Law," offered by Harvard. This suggests, the report states, that bringing together a variety of professionals on the basis of the groups they serve can integrate efforts to serve these groups at a high level of administration, and that the development of these relationships is possible because of the big university's prestige in the community.

OSTI also found that information-developing and disseminating programs were more successful in fulfilling their own stated objectives than were the action-oriented projects.

The Five State Survey of Title I programs conducted by the Greenleigh Associates also referred to previously, looked into the Massachusetts program for both 1966 and 1967. This study does not attempt to evaluate the programs either by comparison with each other, or by progress toward either stated or implied goals. Rather, it describes the situation in the five states surveyed, and offers a variety of data about the programs without making judgments.

About Massachusetts, it makes the following statements: ". . . The state planning agency for Title I has not been related to or in regular touch with other state agencies, or overall state planning. The Title I program has not been seen as an instrument to buttress or supplement overall planning in this state.

"The program initiative in this state has been with the institutions through the projects they have proposed. In the allocation of funds the emphasis has been on the quality of each proposal judged mainly in terms of itself, and on an equitable distribution of funds among the varying kinds of institutions applying. The private educational sector in this state is apparently sensitive to the potential of dominance of the Title I program by the state university system . . . it is clear that special attention was paid here to balancing distribution to public and private institutions.

"This is another state in which Title I administration is carried forward wholly on a part-time basis. This is undoubtedly a deterrent to central direction . . ."

"People in the State Agency are sensitive to the need for greater planning at the state level. The content of Advisory Council meetings reflects tensions between public and private, large and small, academic and non-academic interests. But at the same time there apparently is strong resistance to any tampering with the prerogatives and initiatives possessed by the separate and autonomous participating institutions."

These statements indicate that the program has some way yet to go in fulfilling the requirement of providing a comprehensive, coordinated, state-wide plan, but the report concludes: "Nevertheless, there are developments in this state pointing toward greater cooperation and collaboration within and among educational institutions, and between them and community agencies". It cites the Metrocenter (Boston University) study, and the Center for Community Studies at Worcester as examples of developing cooperative relationships. Greenleigh also notes the growing sensitivity in the Title I Advisory Council to the need for further clarification of objectives at the state level, and to the desirability of fostering greater cooperation among academic groups and between them and community agencies.

It is too soon to tell how much more successful the program will be in meeting some of the objectives stated, as a result of the development of a focus for the Fiscal 1968 State Plan Amendment because the projects funded under this amendment have yet to be evaluated.

It can be said, however, that the State Agency and the State Advisory Council now have had sufficient experience with this program to have come to some definite conclusions about how it should be conducted in this state. In commissioning this report the Higher Education

Facilities Commission evidenced its concern about the general directions and progress of this program, and its interest in gathering the pertinent information which would help to provide guidance for the Title I effort in the years ahead.

In the opinion of the author, the program has been reasonably well accepted among a number of institutions of higher education in the state, and has stimulated the development of some interesting proposals. It has made possible the pooling of resources between institutions in a few cases, such as the University of Massachusetts - Boston College program on Home Rule, the Worcester Center for Community Studies, jointly sponsored by Holy Cross, Worcester Polytechnic, and Clark; and the Massasoit-Stonehill projects in police training and regional planning.

In addition, some important agencies and groups in the communities have been involved in the Title I programs, and the effects of these contacts could prove to be fruitful and long lasting.

The author believes that even with the present low level of appropriations for this program, much more could be accomplished if substantial modifications were made in the administration. These steps are presented in the Recommendations found in Chapter I of this paper, and in Chapter III on the State Agency in Massachusetts.

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT OF A FOCUS FOR THE STATE PLAN

When the HEFC began receiving proposals for Title I grants the problems the institutions proposed to deal with covered a wide range of community problems. The general headings used to describe them were:

Economic and Social Problems

Governmental Problems

Educational and Vocational Problems

Community Leadership and Citizen Education

The range of community problems in Massachusetts was very similar to that reported by other states and for the country as a whole. However, since no classification system was established for Title I projects prior to the development of the state plans, it is difficult to compare them.

The U. S. Office of Education is now working on the development of such a system, and eventually there will be a uniform system for classification of Title I projects which will facilitate comparisons and communication about the program.

In the meantime, however, the following tabulation is available for 1967 of the number of projects funded in each of the Office of Education's suggested categories for the fifty states and for the state of Massachusetts.

Table 6

Problem Areas Named by all States and by Massachusetts 'Fiscal 1967 (Title I, HEA 1965)

	Number of Programs			
Problem Area	U.S.	%	Mass.	%
Community Development	83	17	2	12
Health	62	13	0	0
Government	59	12	7	44
Land Use	57	11	0	0
Poverty	46	10	3	20
Youth Opportunities	44	9	1	6
Recreation	36	7	1	6
Human Relations	30	6	2	12
Employment	20	4	0	0
Economic Development	20	4	0	0
Personal Development	16	3	0	0
Transportation	12	2	0	0
Housing	7	1	0	0
TOTAL	492	100%	16	100%

For Fiscal 1968, 53 states and territories developed State Plan Amendments specifying the problem areas in which they would fund proposals for the year.

The number of problem areas named ranged from 1 to 10, with fifty percent choosing from 1 to 3 problem areas. Two states, Texas and Massachusetts, chose only one area, and both of these chose the area of Government. In all, 47 of the 53 states and territories chose Government as one of the problem areas. Many of the other problem areas listed below are also related to government in one way or another. The problem areas, and the number of states focusing on these areas, are listed below:

Table 7

Problem Areas Named by States,
Fiscal 1968 (Title I, HEA 1965)

Problem Area	Number of States
Government	47
Health	29
Community Development	22
Recreation	21
Human Relations	18
Employment	16
Poverty	16
Land Use	15
Youth Opportunities	15
Economic Development	14
Human Resources Development	13
Housing	11
Transportation	6

Specific Steps Taken

Being concerned about its responsibility to develop a comprehensive, coordinated, state-wide plan for Title I programs in Massachusetts, the Title I Advisory Council undertook several steps in preparing its 1968 Amendment.

First, it discussed the feasibility of surveying problems in Massachusetts in order to establish priorities so that it could effectively allocate its limited resources.

Second, it studied interviews with a number of community representatives and educators from institutions of higher education in the Boston area.

Third, it held a Conference on Higher Education and Community Service, in April, 1967, at which representatives from all the eligible institutions for Title I programs were invited to discuss community problems and program priorities.

Fourth, it considered the findings and recommendations concerning program priorities contained in the First Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

Fifth, it considered the experience of other states in relation to developing state plan amendments.

To develop a focus for the State Plan the Executive Director, Dr. Richard McCann, in accordance with a directive from the Title I Advisory Council, requested that the author of this report work with Miss Maureen Osolnik, assistant to the HEFC director, and a consultant, Mr. Robert Doyle, of the Bureau of Public Affairs, Boston College, to assist the Executive Director in drafting the 1968 Amendment. As they worked, it became evident that local government was the most reasonable focus for the State Plan.

For example, it was clear that in 1967, the Massachusetts Title I program already had a predominant concern with government in its broad sense. It included such projects as the training of government officials and administrators with respect to finances and budgeting, law enforcement, regional planning, architectural design, and the preservation of historical areas in urban renewal areas.

Furthermore, this concern for the quality of government was confirmed throughout the discussions of the Title I Advisory Council, the deliberations of the Conference on Higher Education and Community Service, and the interviews with representatives of community agencies, business, government, and others.

Again and again in the proposals from the institutions the problems identified were ascribed to poorly functioning or nonexistent local governmental agencies. Also noted was the lack of effective relationships between these agencies and all the other structures which work in the community to provide services to citizens.

The State Plan Amendment was written and subsequently approved by the Council, the Commission, and the Washington office administering Title I.

Focus: Local Government

The local government focus is intended to concentrate the proposals on the central concern of developing the competence and resources of local governing bodies to deal with community problems. For example, the Plan states:

> "The concept of local government used here does not conceive of dealing only with what might be called the formal structure of government. If a problem which is basically social has some implication for the improvement of

> local government, then the problem would be proper for consideration under this plan."

The State Plan also gave some illustrations of the kinds of problems that might be dealt with by institutions. However, it was not intended that these be exhaustive but rather that institutions think imaginatively about how their resources and concerns might be linked to the State Plan Focus.

The four illustrative aspects of the central problem discussed in the State Plan were:

1. Powers and responsibilities of local government;
2. Operations and practices of local government;
3. Urban planning and redevelopment;
4. Planning for conservation of natural resources.

To help clarify the flexibility of the Focus with reference to these illustrative aspects of the central problems, the Plan states:

> "The concept of local government is not a narrowly limiting one. Rather it is somewhat broad, encompassing the development of both the resources and the competence of local governing bodies. The community is the arena in which the local government operates. In fact, the latter is an integral part of the former. Therefore, improvement of local government may come about either by working on a problem within the local government structure itself (competence), or by improving aspects of the community in which the

> government operates (resources). Thus, only those projects which deal with problems whose solutions can be directly related to either an improvement in the local government structure, or an improvement in the community as it relates to local government, will be appropriate to this amendment. This set of criteria is quite broad in concept and allows for a variety of approaches to the problems of the community.
>
> "The projects approved will deal in some manner with the improvement of local government, whether it be through training municipal employees, or education and involvement of key individuals or citizen groups in their local government. We are aware of the need for cooperation between this and other federal programs which deal with allied areas of interest."

The Importance of Local Government as a Focus for the State Plan

The ability of our system to meet the needs of its citizens in times of rapid change is being questioned seriously. The Ninth Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations declares that the American federal system is on trial today as never before in this century, and that when gains are measured against needs, progress seems discouragingly slow. "Many states and localities," it states, "still cling to policies and practices that hardly satisfied the modest requirements of a bygone era and are grossly unsuited to cope with today's urgent challenges . . . some policies and attitudes of the Federal establishment continue more attuned to the problems and solutions of the thirties and forties, than to the horizon of the seventies and eighties.

"The challenges of today are cast in seething racial unrest and civil disorder, burgeoning crime and delinquency, alarming differences in individual opportunity for education, housing and employment. Historically, these constitute one more - albeit a highly dramatic - chapter in the age-old American struggle to fulfill the mighty promise of Jefferson's Declaration within and through the balanced, constitutional system framed by the Founders in the Great Charter of 1789.

"The manner of meeting these challenges will largely determine the fate of the American political system; it will determine if we can maintain a form of government marked by partnership and wholesome competition among national, state and local levels, or if instead - in the face of threatened anarchy - we must sacrifice political diversity as the price of the authoritative action required for the Nation's survival."

The Title I Advisory Council's judgment of the situation in this state was that there was so much to be done in the area of local government in Massachusetts, that this should be the main thrust of the program at this time.

In Massachusetts, as in most other states, the metropolitan areas in which most people live are governed by a complex tangle of bureaus, boards, commissions, authorities, councils, committees, districts and regions. Some of these agencies are run by professionals, some by volunteers. Many of them operate under procedures set up to deal with the needs of communities a hundred, even two hundred years ago. They are independent of each other in many cases, are uncoordinated, and have failed to meet the needs of the metropolitan areas for transportation, housing, recreation, economic development, health, welfare, education and law enforcement. To say that they have failed means that our local governments are inadequate in structure and resources to do what is necessary to prevent continuing blight and strife and to make our communities habitable and attractive.

The complexity of the area of local government is one aspect of the problem. Another is its rapid expansion. As our population grows there are more people to be served, and our rising standard of living requires more services from our local governments. In Massachusetts, local government is already the largest source of employment. The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projections of employment in state and local government indicate that this category of employment will increase by 48% between 1965 and 1975, indicating the magnitude of the growth in both size and the functions of local government.

The Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns reports that there are now one hundred thousand municipal employees in 130 job classifications, many of whom need training of one kind or another in order to do their jobs effectively. Further, little or no training is now available for these employees. If Title I funds were used to develop the resources of institutions of higher education for the training of government employees, this would strengthen both the universities and their communities, as well as developing relationships between them which could be useful to all parties.

The training of government employees is of course only one aspect of improving local government. Other aspects are the coordination of services of agencies serving the communities, and devising procedures to make most effective use of financial and human resources. Programs which would increase public understanding of community problems, and help to suggest solutions which would be acceptable, would also be included under the general area of improvement of local government.

To summarize, the following factors were important in the decision to focus in the area of local government.

First, of course, is the limited amount of money available and the magnitude of the task of developing a comprehensive, coordinated plan for community service programs.

Second, is the consideration of the most effective use of resources, both financial, informational and human. In its First Annual Report the National Advisory Council expressed concern about the adequacy of the resources available for the job, and this is a concern shared by the State Advisory Council. It is felt by the Advisory Council that if the resources of the Title I program, both in the State Agency and in the universities, were concentrated on one problem area, that there would be more impact than if efforts were diffused into a number of areas.

Third, is the possibility of carrying out the legislative mandate of developing a comprehensive, coordinated plan. It is naturally more feasible to develop a statewide plan for one problem area than to do the same for the entire range of problems identified in the state.

Fourth, is the question of developing resources to serve community needs within the institutions of higher education. If the money is available in one area, it follows that the institutions will be able to do a more effective job of developing programs for that area, thereby increasing their competence to deal with that range of problems.

Fifth, is the consideration of impact. With resources concentrated in one problem area, it is to be expected that results would be more immediately forthcoming, and it would be possible to show what actually is possible in this area if substantial resources are devoted to it.

Sixth, is the importance of local government to the solution of community problems. This is particularly true with respect to developing long-range plans for preventing or solving problems in the community. Without effective agencies of local government, and coordination between their functions, community problems will not be solved.

Recommended Action on Massachusetts State Plan Focus

The area of local government having been chosen as the focus for the Massachusetts State Plan for the years immediately ahead, the author recommends that the following steps be taken to increase the Title I program's effectiveness in this area:

1. Contact the institutions of higher education to determine which of them have a special competence and interest in local government.

2. Select three or four institutions to serve as a Consortium to undertake a three to five year program. The purpose of this program would be to set up community problem-solving projects dealing with local government and to gather and disseminate information about local government. In the course of these activities a wide variety of institutions, organizations and agencies would become involved in developing specific projects devoted to the solution of community problems.

   In effect, the institutions in the Consortium would become regional resource centers for information, materials, programs and personnel, and could be used for a wide range of local government projects.

   In addition, the Consortium would be charged with assisting in developing the annual refinements of the State Plan Focus so that over a period of years a reasonable impact would be made on local government problems.

3. To effect a long-range commitment the State Agency would have to be willing to commit a portion of its annual allocation to the Consortium. Presently, there is no legal way of making such a commitment, but if the institutions saw a strong State Agency determined to focus a portion of its energy and resources on a significant problem, it is quite likely that the arrangements could be worked out.

4. At some appropriate time in the future, possibly about five years from now, the Focus would be modified or shifted, and a new Consortium could be set up. The old one would be continued on non-Title I funds, absorbed by the institutions, or phased out.

In the event that this recommendation cannot be implemented in the near future, the following less effective but still useful activity should be undertaken.

1. Establish a Task Force on Local Government comprised of representatives of institutions of higher education, government and private citizens, to gather data about problems of local government.

2. Have the Task Force establish procedures for determining priorities among the local problems identified.

3. Hold educational meetings and prepare informational materials about local government problems so that institutions, organizations and agencies can develop projects for funding from Title I or other sources.

The point of these recommendations is to emphasize that it is fruitless to develop a State Plan with a major focus, without also committing funds to support programs that will develop high quality projects in sufficient quantity to insure the achievement of measurable results on the focus problem selected.

Relevance of Local Government Focus to National Problems

Problems of government are apparent in many states, and a large majority of all the states have chosen government as one of the problem areas for attention under Title I programs. Considering the widespread interest in this area, and the very grave problems it presents for many communities in the nation, it is appropriate for many of the Title I programs to be focused on this area.

Concentration on this area by many states also offers the possibility of comparative research and pooled findings, which could be extremely valuable on a nation-wide scale.

CHAPTER VII

DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE AND EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

Of great importance among the basic purposes of the Title I legislation is the intention to stimulate new educational approaches and organizational arrangements to deliver more effective continuing education and community service programs. This intention has not yet been realized to any great degree.

The author's close association with Massachusetts and his more general acquaintance with the activities of other states leads him to conclude that a great deal of work remains to be done in this area, even though there are some interesting examples of new organizational and program approaches. Most encouraging in Massachusetts have been the new intra- and inter-institutional arrangements that have been set up to deliver programs.

Generally speaking, however, the bulk of Title I activities have been cast in traditional educational formats such as conferences, seminars and courses. While these approaches have proved appropriate in some instances, they often appear to be simply the result of stereotyped thinking.

It would be unrealistic to believe that merely listing examples of innovative programs would inspire many people to change their pattern of doing more of what has been done before. Truly innovative efforts occur when thoughtful people grapple with real problems with which they are involved and concerned. Nevertheless, the author would be remiss not to mention a few areas where increased efforts to experiment and innovate would be most likely to produce beneficial results.

Organizational Innovations

1. Task Forces: One urgent need in Massachusetts is for the development of Task Forces set up to deal with particular high priority community problems. The Task Forces should consist of representatives from governmental agencies, voluntary and professional associations, and universities. Other special interest groups associated with the particular problem would also be included. Close liaison with the mass media would be maintained.

   These Task Forces would determine how existing resources, program and services could be most efficiently coordinated. They would also suggest new programs and approaches to be undertaken.

   Obvious examples of problem areas around which such Task Forces in Massachusetts should be organized would be employment, housing, education, pollution, and conservation.

2. Consortia: As universities with common interests, in particular, community problems are brought together in Task Forces or other arrangements, consortia can be established to enable them to share information and resources in collaborative programs. These joint efforts allow each institution to maintain its identity and autonomy. There are well over one thousand such consortia in the United States today but few in the field of continuing education.

3. Resource Centers: As particular institutions develop long-range commitments to particular program or problem areas, resources from Title I and elsewhere ought to be obtained to enable the individual institutions to become "resource centers" - places where other institutions, organizations and agencies

can go for materials and assistance in the designated areas.

Again, there exist a number of such specialized 'resource centers" across the country which function very effectively. The most recent example of this type of activity are the urban studies centers which have sprouted in the last decade. The task in Massachusetts is to encourage the development of a wider range of such centers to cover unmet needs and to work to see that existing or planned centers function to serve the needs of continuing education and community service.

An excellent example of a resource center which directly serves the field of continuing education is located at Montclair State College, New Jersey. (A brief description of their service is contained in Appendix F).

4. Regional Projects: Because many community problems occur also in adjoining states it would be advisable for Massachusetts to work with other states in the New England region in order to share ideas, materials and resources. The high costs of program development dictate that innovative organizational arrangements be considered to deal with problems common to adjoining states or for programs to provide continuing education and community service programs for a region that cuts across state lines. Both the Washington office and the Massachusetts Title I Advisory Council have encouraged establishing regional programs, but limited staff resources prevent significant accomplishments in this area.

5. Cooperative Research: As indicated earlier in this report there is a great unmet need for data gathering on the needs of continuing education and community service. Virtually nothing has been accomplished

> in this area in Massachusetts although a great deal of discussion has taken place. Some states, such as Connecticut, have carried out extensive studies to determine needs and resources. As Connecticut moves into long-range program development it will have a much higher level of confidence that programs are on target and will be able to direct the maximum resources to achievable goals

Massachusetts abounds with competent research facilities and organizations. Mahy of these organizations are studying problems of interest to the Title I State Agency. Discussions should be held with these groups to determine common interests and to find means for developing cooperative research arrangements which would be mutually beneficial. For example, as the author interviewed representatives of community and governmental agencies for the Boston University Metropolitan Education Project it was apparent that many organizations were willing to discuss cooperative projects.. Particularly encouraging were discussions with the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development, the Port Authority, the Metropolitan District Commission, and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. While no commitments were made or even requested in these exploratory interviews, it was evident that substantial intellectual, technical and financial resources were untapped.

Still another research resource (one which is directly concerned with continuing education) warrants further exploration. The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education (MACE) is presently surveying adult education in Massachusetts. Depending somewhat on the results of this survey, to be completed in June 1968, MACE may decide to engage in another study that would investigate needs and resources in higher continuing education.

The Massachusetts Title I State Agency should immediately begin negotiations with MACE to determine areas of common interest. It is possible that a novel research arrangement could be established that would use MACE funds to help support the Massachusetts Title I program. Without specifying all the details, such an arrangement might be possible because MACE contracts its work to institutions and organizations with research competence. If research projects were designed which a university or consortium of universities were interested in undertaking, MACE funds could be used as the universities' Title I contribution, thereby encouraging them to undertake the research project at no cost to them. The advantage to MACE would be that they could get "twice the bang for a buck" as federal funds could be obtained through Title I on a 50-50 basis, so long as the project contained a significant educational component, in addition to the research.

Educational Innovations

1. Educational Programs for Continuing Education and Community Service Personnel:

   Although the U. S. Office of Education held a number of useful briefing sessions for institutional representatives about Title I their limitation was that they were necessarily brief" and could not meet the continuing needs of the personnel who were responsible for developing Title I programs. Massachusetts should arrange for an institution to conduct educational conferences, workshops, institutes and other activities to teach personnel in the field how to develop and conduct effective programs of continuing education for community service.

A model for this kind of program is the State of New York, where an educational program for continuing education and community service personnel was carried out in the spring of 1967 using Title I funds. As one of the staff for this program at the Institute* the author had the opportunity to evaluate the effort and found it to be very effective.

2. Innovative Learning Approaches:

As mentioned earlier, most of the Title I projects use very traditional approaches to adult learning, and often these traditional approaches are quite appropriate. Whenever possible, however, the projects should consider using new formats or more imaginative combinations of traditional approaches.

For example, "gaming or simulation exercises have been very effective in business and government programs in recent years. Films are being produced for closed-circuit TV training programs for medical personnel in hospitals. FM radio has been used to reach audiences unable to attend conferences and institutes. Independent study through tapes, recordings and correspondence is highly developed for credit courses but has not been experimented with for community problem-solving.

Another deficiency in Title I programs has been the lack of development of materials for mass education, such as were developed by the Region Plan Association of New York about five years ago. The materials, distributed on commuter trains and similar gathering points, effectively supplemented a TV series on regional planning that also was tied in to local community discussion. (A modification of this program has been funded in Massachusetts through the University of Massachusetts - Boston).

---

* (A summary report of the Syracuse University Institute on Community Service Programming is included as Appendix G).

4. The Urban Extension Agent:

Institutions of higher education, physically bound to their campuses, have done very little to extend their reach as a result of Title I projects. Agricultural extension traditionally provided personnel for work "in the field", but no such counterpart has developed on any broad scale for urban areas.

It is unlikely that the urban agent" approach will develop spontaneously. Because Massachusetts has such a wealth of educational resources in the Boston Metropolitan area, there is a very evident need to experiment with the establishment of an urban extension agent project to test the effectiveness of preparing a professional urban extension staff to serve the people and organizations of a particular area. The primary task would be to serve as a liaison between the community and the various institutions of higher education in the metropolitan region. As the relationship evolved the urban extension agent would begin to stimulate the development of new projects and programs and to set up educational activities where it is clear no other organization or agency is prepared to do so. Such an agent would be expected to represent a variety of institutions but basically ought to be attached to the University of Massachusetts.

Obviously, there are a number of difficult financial, administrative and political problems to be worked out, which is why this effort should be experimental and long-range. However, should

> Massachusetts consider such an experiment it would be able to build upon previous experiences of other institutions. For example, the Ford Foundation provided close to five million dollars for experimental programs in urban research, teaching and extension which included the concept of the urban extension agent. Reports of these programs are available.
>
> Another interesting urban project is going on in Buffalo, where the State University of New York is experimenting under Title I with a "store front" approach in a disadvantaged community. In Pittsburgh a private organization, Action-Housing, Inc., is using a neighborhood extension worker who serves as a liaison between neighborhoods and other agencies and organizations, including the universities. The University of California at Berkeley has had an urban extension agent in the East Bay area, while the state-wide extension system has thirteen community development specialists linking the community and the university as a part of their Title I program.

These comments are meant to be suggestive of the kinds of innovative and experimental activities that could be undertaken in Massachusetts. They are intended to acquaint the reader with a sampling of the wide range of possibilities open under the Title I program. These examples illustrate again the great potential for the development of effective continuing education and community service programs under this important legislation.

The Massachusetts Title I program should fulfill the objectives of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by seizing the opportunity it provides for testing new ideas, developing new organizational arrangements, and putting into action at the points of greatest need imaginative new methods of delivering community service.

Title I provides the framework and basic financial support. It is up to the state and the institutions to consider the proposals put forward in this report and other sources in finding ways to obtain the maximum benefit from this timely legislation.

APPENDIX A

Biographical Data About Author

Name: Kenneth Haygood

Education: M.A., Ph.D. Division of Social Sciences, University of Chicago

Positions:

(Present) Staff Associate, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. (A national center for the study and development of continuing education at institutions of higher education).

(future) (as of June, 1968)
Dean of Continuing Education and Associate Professor of Adult Education, Cleveland State University.

Senior Associate, Leadership Resources, Inc. (A nationwide management education and consulting organization).

(past) Director, Informal Programs, University of Chicago.

Field Director, Citizen Information Service of Metropolitan Chicago.

Staff, Chicago Commission on Human Relations.

Research Assistant, Human Dynamics Laboratory, University of Chicago.

Teaching: Boston University, Loyola University (Chicago), University of Chicago Industrial Relations Center, George Williams College.

Consultations: Title I, HEA 1965: States of New York, California, Connecticut, and Maine.

Has served clients such as U. S. Post Office Department, U. S. Air Force, IBM, Communications Workers of America, Ethicon, Inc., U S. Department of Labor, Montgomery Ward and Company, The American Public Power Association, and others.

Publications: "University Urban Research, Extension and Education Programs: A Status Report of the Ford Foundation Public Affairs Division Grants in Urban and Regional Affairs."
Mimeographed, 27 pp. February, 1962, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

"Shaping the Urban Culture: The role of Higher Education in the Evolving Urban Scene." Adult Education, Autumn, 1963.

The University and Community Education, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962, Notes and Essays No. 36.

A Live Option: The Future of the Evening College, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1965, 97 pp. Notes and Essays No. 46, editor.

APPENDIX B Document 1

COPY OF ORIGINAL

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Higher Education Facilities Commission
45 Bromfield Street, Boston 02108

December 14, 1967

Mr. Kenneth Haygood
Staff Associate
C.S.L.E.A.
138 Mountfort Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02146

Dear Mr. Haygood:

Massachusetts has earned a leadership role with its program under Title I (HEA '65), Community Services and Continuing Education. We wish to continue to deserve this reputation at the national level as well as to provide the best possible program for Massachusetts with the funds available under this Title. It is by no means too early for the Advisory Council and the Higher Education Facilities Commission to begin their deliberations in anticipation of the amendments to the State Plan which will outline our program for Fiscal 1969.

As you know, the OSTI report, evaluating the 1966 program is in hand. We will need to evaluate the 1967 program and we will need to appraise our total activities thus far as a prelude to devising and carrying forward a program to be recommended for 1969.

In considering our approach to this appraisal and projection, Dr. Leo Redfern, at a recent meeting, suggested that we obtain the services of a person who is knowledgeable in the area of community services and continuing education at the State and local levels as well as the national level to prepare a working paper which would appraise the Massachusetts program to date and project some viable program directions for the future. The Committee and subsequently the Advisory Council were unanimous in identifying you as the best qualified person to undertake this assignment.

The purpose of this letter is to inquire whether you would be interested in such an assignment and able to undertake it with an approximate deadline of March 15th. Naturally, the scope of the project would need to be firmed up with regard to objectives, time, staff and funds. If you would be willing to entertain this request, I would appreciate receiving from you, at your earliest convenience, a proposal including a tentative budget which would incorporate your views as to the best means of accomplishing the task.

Sincerely yours,

S/Donald E. Deyo
Acting Executive Director

DED:jhd
cc: Mr. Leo Redfern

APPENDIX B Document 2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Donald Deyo, Executive Director
Higher Education Facilities Commission

FROM: Kenneth Haygood, Staff Associate, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University

RE: PREPARATION OF A WORKING PAPER ON THE MASSACHUSETTS CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM, TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

This memorandum is a proposal for a working paper, including a time schedule and budget.

PURPOSE OF WORKING PAPER

To appraise the Massachusetts program as it has developed to date, to recommend future directions it should take, and to suggest activities necessary to develop a more effective program.

BACKGROUND

Massachusetts has already established an effective program in spite of the adverse conditions under which it has had to operate. Massachusetts deserves the good reputation it has at the national level for this program. The task now is to further advance the thinking and planning for this program.

CONTENT OF THE WORKING PAPER

This paper will build upon the work that has been done to date, such as the New England Board of Higher Education Memorandum of Recommendations for Establishing the Continuing Education and Community Service Program, the State Plan and Amendments, and the OSTI Evaluation Report.

The paper will compare the Massachusetts program to other state programs. Mr. Paul Delker, USOE Administrator of Title I, HEA, has agreed to cooperate with the author of the Working Paper in examining activities of other states that might be relevant to Massachusetts. Also, because the author has served as a consultant on Title I to five other states, he will be able to draw on such experiences.

The paper will further refine the focus of the present State Plan and suggest possible amendments for the coming year.

The paper will discuss the present arrangements for administration of the program in Massachusetts and suggest modifications that seem in order, particularly with relation to the expenditure of funds for special projects that will help institutions of higher education and cooperating organizations to plan and carry out more effective continuing education and community service programs.

Finally, the paper will suggest innovative activities and experiments that the State Agency might encourage educational institutions to undertake. For example, the idea of an "urban agent" as a generalist to serve as a liaison between educational institutions and the urban community has been advanced and some experimentation has been attempted with varying results. An examination of the relevance of this and other innovative approaches for Massachusetts will be made and recommendations presented.

WORK PLAN FOR THE PAPER

The Working Paper will be the sole responsibility of the author. He will prepare the paper using whatever resources seen to him to be appropriate. A small Advisory Committee will be established to review the work plan, progress of the paper, and offer suggestions on its final form. The paper will be submitted to the Higher Education Facilities Commission for disposition as it sees fit.

APPENDIX C

In addition to Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education focused its attention on the role of the university in carrying out programs under the following three enactments.

The State Technical Services Act of 1965 promotes commerce and encourages economic growth by providing for a national program of incentives and support in which

> ". . . States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly. . . by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology. . ."

Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 addresses the problem of the nation's rapid urban expansion and seeks to:

> ". . . (1) provide special training and skills needed for economic and efficient community development and (2) support research in new or improved methods of dealing with community development problems."

The Act is carried out by assisting and encouraging the states

> ". . .in cooperation with public or private universities and colleges and urban centers to (1) organize, initiate, develop, and expand programs which will provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical and

> professional people who are, or are training to be, employed by governmental or public body which has responsibilities for community development."

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914, as amended in 1953 and 1962, establishes a cooperative system of extension work by colleges:

> "In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same."

The extension work is carried out by the colleges in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

APPENDIX D

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Higher Education Facilities Commission
45 Bromfield Street, Boston 02108

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AND ITS SUB-COMMITTEES UNDER TITLE I (HEA 1965)

The Congressional intent and mandate in Title I (HEA '65) are important:

> To utilize existing college and university resources and capabilities in the solution of community problems.
>
> To alert colleges and universities not heretofore participating in community affairs to the contributions their resources can make in the solution of community problems.
>
> To encourage existing agencies to identify community problems and to seek the means of their solution through continuing education.
>
> To encourage new relationships and initiative between institutions of higher education and communities for the solution of community problems.

Membership on the Advisory Council and its sub-committees is therefore important to the fulfillment of these objectives. Members are appointed by the Governor by reason of their individual qualifications and not as institutional or agency representatives. Acceptance of appointment implies that the individual is aware of its significance and undertakes a commitment to utilize his insights and experience as a contribution to these objectives. Because of the contribution only he can make, and the necessity for continuity, it is expected that the member's attendance will be as regular as possible.

1. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership of the Council or committee.

2. If a member of the Council or committee is unable to attend meeting(s), he may designate another individual in writing, ad hoc, to substitute for him. In this case, the substitute shall have all the rights, privileges and responsibilities of the member.

3. Members of the Council or committees who fail to attend three consecutive meetings will be assumed, because of other duties and responsibilities, to be unable to fulfill their commitment under Title I and that they intend to resign.

4. In order to avoid any suggestion of vested or conflict of interest, a member or his substitute will be expected to absent himself when a project proposal originating in his institution or agency is discussed and evaluated.

5. Actions and recommendations of the Council and its committees are not final until acted upon by the Higher Education Facilities Commission. Therefore, all discussions, evaluations and recommendations regarding a project proposal are to be considered as confidential until acted upon by the Higher Education Facilities Commission and the institutional sponsor has been notified under normal procedures.

6. The Council and screening committee will rank project proposals and recommendations in three categories (see Sec. 4, State Plan):

   A. Those projects which are recommended to be funded within the limits of available funds.

   B. Those projects which the Council or screening committee would be willing to recommend if funds were available.

C. Those projects which the Council or screening committee are not willing to recommend for approval or funding.

In its classifications and recommendations, the Council and screening committee shall prepare fo each project placed in category B or C a brief list of reasons and explanations for assigning the category. These reasons and explanations may be used by the Commission's professional staff in notifying applicants of the disposition of the project proposal.

7. Sec. 3B of the State Plan states:

> The Commission, through its Advisory Council, professional staff, and cooperating institutions and agencies will continue to develop, refine and improve the state-wide coordinated system of Community Service and Continuing Education by the following means:
>
> By conducting surveys, both local and state-wide, for identification of community problems and priorities.
>
> By continuing to assess feasibility of methods and suitability of institutional resources.
>
> By assisting in improving the quality of project proposals, by means of consultation and conferences.
>
> By working towards the consolidation of efforts by institutions of higher education, and stimulating cooperative thinking and joint planning.

The Council and/or screening committee is free to undertake the initiative to carry out this section either before or after a closing date even if such initiative should affect the ultimate classification and recommendation of the project proposal.

8. Steps in the evaluation of project proposals are as follows:

   Copies of all proposals received as of a particular closing date will be mailed
t to each member of the Advisory Council.

   The Council's screening sub-committee will meet to review the project proposals and to rank them as recommendations to the Advisory Council.*

   The Council will meet to consider the recommendations of the screening committee and to forward these recommendations either as is, or amended to the Higher Education Facilities Commission.*

   The Commission will review and give final approval of the projects to be funded.

9. A record (not formal or published minutes) shall be maintained of the meetings of the Council and committees. Among the items to be recorded are attendance, a summary of discussion, recommendations and evaluative judgments concerning project proposals.

DED
11/17/67

---

* It has been suggested that the Project Director of each project proposal be asked to "stand by" his telephone or otherwise be available at the time of these meetings in order to supply information and answer questions that might arise concerning his project.

APPENDIX E

NEW ENGLAND BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
31 Church Street Winchester Massachusetts

Abridged Memorandum to Members of the State Agency Designated to Administer Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965:

On January 25th, 1966, a small group of individuals from the Boston area who are concerned with continuing education and community service came together in the offices of the New England Board of Higher Education to discuss the development and operation of a Massachusetts State Plan for the administration of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. These persons, who came as individuals rather than representatives of their institutions, achieved consensus on the broad guidelines that would be desirable for the development and administration of a State Plan, which they wish to make available for the consideration of the agency designated to administer the Plan. Those present at the meeting were:

James Baker
Director of Continuing Education
Boston University

William Dwyer
President
Board of Regional Community Colleges

Kenneth Haygood
CSLEA

William Kavaraceus
The Lincoln Filene's Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs

Martin Lichterman
Director
NEBHE

Garton Needham
Vice President
Simmons College

Virginia L. Senders
Associate Director
NEBHE

John B. Whitla
Northeastern University

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

It is recommended that the State Plan be focused on community needs and community problems, rather than on educational institutions. In order to develop such a State Plan the Advisory Committee must be composed of persons knowledgeable about colleges and universities, about extension and continuing education, and about community problems. They should be chosen according to the following criteria:

1. The Committee should be large enough to represent a diversity of competencies and points of view, but small enough to insure active participation by all its members - probably not fewer than ten members nor more than fifteen.
2. Members should be practicing experts in their fields of activity.
3. Members should be appointed as individuals, rather than as representatives of their agencies.
4. Interests and competencies included among members should encompass a broad spectrum of community problems.
5. Members should be knowledgeable about activities and programs within the State and elsewhere, and they should know the people who can be called upon for support and information.
6. In addition to having specialized expertise, members should be selected for their broad views of community needs and community problems. They should not have individual programmatic axes to grind.
7. Committee members should be drawn from all geographic areas of the State.

The kinds of agencies or action areas from which such individuals might be drawn include, among others, the following: the Poverty Program, the mass media, the Division of Employment Security and the Department of Labor, civil rights groups, groups concerned with children and youth, United Community Services, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, conservation and natural resources, recreation, religious organizations, political education, corrections and criminology, agencies already concerned with social action, the arts, libraries, and the museums, mental health, business and industry, and mass transportation. In addition, of course, the Advisory Committee should include several persons who are involved in extension or continuing education programs in the colleges or universities or who are broadly knowledgeable about these programs.

The Advisory Committee will begin its work by gathering information about community problems and about the educational resources of the State. In addition to the information gathered by reading and from consultants upon whom the Advisory Committee will call, more detailed analyses of community problems may be developed by special task forces which the Advisory Committee will appoint. For example, after a relatively superficial survey of many areas of community needs, the Advisory Committee may decide that probably the State Plan should focus upon two or three specified needs, and should appoint task forces to make more detailed surveys of research and action programs in these areas, and to make recommendations of possible ways in which institutions of higher learning may use their special strengths and resources in the solutions of these problems. At a later stage, when the State Plan is in operation, the task forces may also be called upon to assist the Advisory Committee in its evaluation of proposals. The task forces will also work with the Advisory Committee in evaluating progress made under the State Plan on specified areas of community need. One task force should be concerned with surveying and codifying information about institutional resources in the State.

When a State Plan has been developed, the Advisory Committee will be responsible for collecting proposals from institutions of higher education within the State and for evaluating these proposals and making recommendations to the State Agency. In collecting proposals and making recommendations the Committee should be guided by four basic principles:

1. Existing instituional strengths should be fully exploited, but institutions that have not previously been active in continuing education and community service should be encouraged and helped to assume this new commitment.

2. Competitive bidding often produces a great deal of wasteful effort. Many institutions may devote time, personnel, and financial resources to the preparation of detailed proposals when only a few projects can be funded. The Advisory Committee should set up procedures that will minimize this waste.

3. Where institutions develop programs independently and in isolation, gaps in offerings often develop while other offerings are duplicated. Functioning as a coordinating body, the Advisory Committee should assist institutions to develop programs cooperatively, sharing their strengths and complementing each other's efforts.

4. The fourth general principle was that enunciated by the President when he said,

   > "The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars,

> conferences, TV programs, and
> task forces drawing on many
> departments of the university -
> all should be brought into play."

> The universities should be seen as resources for service and should be encouraged to be flexible, creative, and innovative, rather than merely to strengthen and enlarge their ongoing programs.

The procedures set up by the Advisory Committee for evaluating and making recommendations on proposals should reflect these principles. The wasted effort involved in preparations of proposals for programs which are ultimately not funded can be eliminated by requiring the submission of preliminary proposals, not more than two or three pages in length. With these in hand, and using the expert knowledge of its task forces on community problems and on education resources, the Advisory Committee can encourage some institutions to prepare more detailed proposals with the expectation that a high proportion of these will ultimately receive awards. At this stage in the evaluation process, the Advisory Committee can also call upon institutions which have resources but which are not submitting proposals, or it can encourage consultation among institutions which have submitted proposals in the same area.

THE STATE PLAN

The State Plan to be developed by the Advisory Committee will be programmatic rather than procedural. The nature of the Plan can be more sharply and clearly understood if we specify some of the things which the State Plan should not be:

The State Plan should not be a detailed statement of procedures for allocating priorities to projects proposed by institutions. This distinguishes the State Plan under

Title I of the Higher Education Act from the type of State Plan submitted under the Higher Education Facilities Act. The State Plan may, however, include among its details such a statement of procedures and priorities.

The State Plan shall not be centered or oriented about the institutional resources of the State. It should not be a Plan which designates to certain classes of institutions one type of responsibility and to other classes of institutions a different type of responsibility.

Rather, the State Plan shall be a Plan which is primarily focused on community problems and community needs. It should consist of a detailed statement of the nature and extent of a limited number (probably not more than three or four) of areas of community problems upon which institutional effort is to be focused. Provision would be made under the Plan to provide institutions with detailed specifications and descriptions of the problems and of the types of solutions that are being sought.

A State Plan of this nature, properly developed and with supporting material to undergird it, would be a major social document. It cannot be completed in the space of a few months. However, with the aid of consultants and expert advice, the Advisory Committee can select from a multitude of possible areas of attack, one or two problems that appear initially to be worthy of immediate effort and attempted solution. It can specify that some of the programs to be developed by the educational institutions should be directed toward an attack on these problems, with the understanding that the nature of the problems or the detailed specifications of the nature of the possible solution will be changed as re-evaluation and further study continue. A substantial proportion of the funds available from the State under the Act (perhaps half) might be allocated to the support of action programs aimed at alleviating the one or two problems specified by the committee in its initial statement.

The remainder of the funds should be reserved for grants to institutions to carry out study and research, perhaps in the form of investigations by individual faculty members, or conferences or seminars of experts, coordinated through the task forces and aimed at the elucidation of a series of problem areas that might later be included among those designated in the State Plan as susceptible to attack. The task forces of the Advisory Committee should monitor the progress of these studies and should use the result for the continual evolution of an improved, problem-focused plan.

Finally, the State Plan should include provision for the consideration of unsolicited proposals from institutions of higher education. Innovation and creativity do not always follow prescribed lines. Bold new ideas may grow out of recognition of needs unique to a single community, or from other sources. Any institution, therefore, which has drawn up the outlines of a proposal for a worthwhile venture in an area outside the general scope of the rest of the Plan, should be encouraged to submit it.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES

Step 1. The designated State Agency should appoint an Advisory Committee.

Step 2. The Advisory Committee should conduct a brief survey of areas of community problems. It should then designate one or two problem areas as those on which it will receive proposals from the universities for immediate action programs.

Step 3. The Advisory Committee should appoint task forces to conduct further studies of the problem areas designated above and of other problem areas upon which programs might be focused in later years. A task force should be appointed on institutional resources.

Step 4. The Advisory Committee should solicit proposals from the colleges and universities for programs directed toward two goals:

A. Action proposals offering solutions in the problem areas designated by the Committee.

B. Research studies devoted to the clarification of needs and opportunities of the community and other problem areas.

Step 5. Task forces should evaluate progress in both action programs and research studies and constantly re-evaluate priorities in the various problem areas and revise the State Plan accordingly.

Step 6. Unsolicited proposals unrelated to the major thrusts of the State Plan should be received and considered by the Advisory Committee.

Step 7. The Advisory Committee should make recommendations to the designated State Agency which, in turn, will make recommendations to the Federal government for the awarding of funds.

APPENDIX F

Continuing Education Resource Center - Montclair State College, New Jersey

To encourage the development of continuing education programs in the communities of New Jersey is the object of a series of five "working seminars in New Jersey this spring. The seminars are sponsored by the Adult Education Resource and Service Center at Montclair State College in Upper Montclair, New Jersey, a new agency set up to serve community adult education. Twenty selected adult educators will meet for five full-day sessions, one a month from February through June, 1968. They will study and design programs that provide for the humanistic, intellectual, civic, and social interests of adults. Specific subjects to be covered are the development of a philosophy of continuing education (February), the literature of adult education (March), program planning for urban and suburban communities (April), and continuing education of women (May). Between seminars, participants will try out modest programs in their own communities. They will have consultative assistance from the center and the use of resources of the Adult Education Graduate Program at Rutgers - The State University, and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. The project is receiving the full cooperation of the Bureau of Adult Education, New Jersey Department of Education, and the New Jersey Association for Adult Education.

The Montclair center is one of several such centers to be established at various state colleges in New Jersey as part of a state-wide program in support of adult education activities. The centers are intended to provide a variety of services and resources. In addition to workshops like the one described here, the Montclair center, for example, will also provide library and consultative services. More information is available from Ray J. Ast, Adult Education Resource and Service Center, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043.

APPENDIX G

Syracuse University Institute on Community Service Programming

Nature of the Program

The Institute was composed of three interrelated phases: a week of residential education conducted at the Syracuse Continuing Education Center to prepare participants for the development of community service programs; a month and a half interim period during which participants prepared program plans; a two-day seminar at one of Syracuse University's Adirondack Conference Centers to evaluate the program plans and discuss practical implementation of them at the community level.

The first week, April 16-21, was devoted to lectures, discussions and work group sessions related to the analysis of major characteristics and problems of urban communities and implications for the development of continuing education programs. Emphasis was placed on the fundamental problems of our urban society and on the practical considerations involved in helping citizens to solve such problems through the development and conduct of continuing education programs. Lecturers and resource persons included experts in various social science fields and those who had had successful experience translating substantive issues into actual continuing education programs.

Throughout the week participants made use of brochures and other publications provided by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, University College, and by various institutions represented in the program. A special collection of books and pamphlets related to the theme of the Institute was arranged by the Library of Continuing Education at the Continuing Education Center. These items were made available for use by all program participants.

While at the Center, participants were able to observe in action one of the community service programs sponsored by the Continuing Education Center. Forty-five governmental and other civic leaders from Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Binghamton, and Utica were at the Center completing an experimental Mid-Career Program for the Local Public Service. Part of this program involved the preparation of metropolitan profiles on each metropolitan area by the participants from the area. During this week in April participants were presenting the results of their research in the development of these metropolitan profiles.

As a practical exercise in the development of program plans based on an actual community situation, institute participants heard a sample "metropolitan profile" report from the Binghamton Mid-Career team. Institute participants were divided into small groups to discuss the various characteristics and problems of Binghamton, and to develop the outline of a sample program plan related to one set of characteristics and problems. For example, one group worked with the economic data presented, one with social problems, one with political and governmental characteristics. Presentations of each program outline were made and discussed before the entire Institute.

During the following month and a half, participants worked at their own institutions developing program plans related to some particular community service project. In most cases individuals worked alone. However, participants from Columbia, Brooklyn College, Bank Street College, Fordham, and New York University developed a consortium arrangement and produced one program plan applicable to the entire New York area.

In the final phase of the project, members of the Institute met for two days in June at Minnowbrook, Syracuse University's Conference Center on Blue Mountain Lake in the Adirondacks. With the guidance and criticism of five university adult educators who had had considerable experience in the field of continuing education for community service, participants reviewed the results of their program planning, discussed strengths and weaknesses, and factors related to the practical implementation of their program plans.

APPENDIX H

TITLE I PROJECTS HEA 1965 - FISCAL 1968.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Babson Inst. Community Relations Division	"Decision Making in Urban Development" - a fifteen week seminar on the economic aspects of urban development and redevelopment.	$ 3,750.
Boston University Metrocenter	A study of agency activity in developing continuing education programs about metropolitan problems to determine the possibilities for inter-institutional cooperation in the Boston Area, and to develop a metropolitan - wide system of collaboration with other institutions.	17,006.
Bridgewater State College - Div. of Continuing Studies	A year-long, weekly seminar on "Water Resources", involving local government, civic and conservation groups, and the general public.	9,000.
Clark University	A seminar on innovative teaching techniques for public school teachers, mostly from low income areas.	13,500.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Dean Junior College	Two seminars and several one-day or evening programs for local government and civic leaders on regional planning and administrative cooperation.	$11,790.
Greenfield Community College	1. A program of training for teacher-aides. 2. A demonstration program in recreation for children and families.	9,000.
Harvard University Department of Social Relations	An eight week program for Negro and white boys focusing on interracial interaction as a technique for improving acceptance of school integration.	7,380.
Harvard University Medical School	A "Colloquium on Human Relations and the Law," monthly meetings for lawyers, court officials and other professionals to stimulate communication between them, and to deal with the problems involved with the lawyer's role in dealing with the problems of his clients.	21,000.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Harvard University - Radcliffe College	A seminar on "Communications for the Volunteer", focusing on the skills necessary for effective use of mass media, fund-raising, public speaking and running effective meetings.	$ 900.
Lowell Technological Institute	1. A conference on economic development - an effort to stimulate new leadership to help our communities bring business growth. 2. A program to match job candidate skills to open position requirements.	22,050.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	A project to develop and systematize teaching material from its on-going summer and Saturday school for disadvantaged junior high school students, known as the M.I.T. Science Day Camp.	5,250.
Northeastern University	Two seminars on social welfare for clergymen from the Boston area, focusing on the impact of technology and organization on society.	15,375.
	Two one-semester seminars on alcoholism to bring together people who may work in the field; and train people who are currently involved.	5,000.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
North Shore Community College		$ 4,500.
	A community survey designed to determine the occupational skills of Beverly residents, to direct qualified people into available positions and to develop training programs where shortages of personnel exist.	
Springfield College		4,148.
	A ten-week seminar to train people who work with ghetto youth, including concepts and practical techniques.	
	A twelve week seminar called the "Police-Community Relations Training Institute" focusing on human dynamics and the role of the police in the community.	3,578
Tufts University		18,508
	The "Storefront School" project for twenty bright Roxbury junior high school students to improve skills and attitudes of the students in order to motivate them educationally.	
	Seminar on "Power in the City" to help develop an effective community organization for securing and administering anti-poverty program funds.	6,375

Institution	Projects	Federal Funds
University of Massachusetts	A program focusing on the problems of air and water pollution, regional planning, population dynamics and community improvement, offered four courses, several public forums. This program began to develop a reference library and a consultation service.	$45,000.
Wentworth Institute	This project involved a survey of the Dorchester and Roxbury areas to identify major causes of underemployment among the disadvantaged youth in these areas and to recommend suitable technical training programs.	6,000.

TITLE I PROJECTS - HEA 1965 - FISCAL 1967

Babson Institute	Financial training for municipal administrators.	4,000.
	Consumer finance training for counselors to families - social workers and clergy.	2,500.
Boston Arch. Center	Architectural design training for governmental administrative personnel involved in architectural decision-making.	13,200.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Boston College		$10,500.
	Acculturation training for volunteers in poverty programs.	
	Training for officials and volunteer workers with the aged mentally ill.	14,500.
Boston University		18,250.
	A program to develop volunteer public sponsors of the arts to relate art to the community.	
	Training program for public administrators.	35,000.
Clark University in cooperation with Holy Cross et. al.		35,000.
	A training program for social agency staff in community development techniques and use of data.	
Dean Junior College		3,000.
	Administration and budget training for small town municipal officials.	
Massasoit Community College in cooperation with Stonehill College		4,250.
	A police training program	
	An education program for local officials and leaders on regional planning needs.	4,250.

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Northeastern	Developing leadership potential of young adults through team-training.	$20,000.
	Workshop for directors of volunteer services.	15,000.
North. Essex Community College	A conference on gerontology for social workers, city officials and citizens.	4,000.
Salem State College	Seminars on urban renewal and historical preservation for local officials and lay committee members.	4,200.
University of Massachusetts	Consumer education training for personnel working with low income groups.	24,000.

TITLE I PROJECTS HEA 1965, FISCAL 1968

Boston College and University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Joint proposal "Modernizing Local Government Through Home Rule" A project to prepare a guide on home rule for Charter Commissions in light of Article 89	27,774

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Boston College (cont.)	of The Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution. In addition, a television assembly will be held to educate persons in the use of the manual.	
Boston College	"Improvement of Local Government Through Collective Bargaining." A Manual on collective bargaining will be prepared for both management and union groups. A symposium presenting a stimulated bargaining situation will be held as a laboratory for the manual.	$13,458
Boston College	"Joint Community-University Center for Inner City Changes." The objectives of the program are to provide skills and methods derived from the social sciences to local government agency staffs, community leaders and residents, as well as to train future social scientists in methods of evaluation and intervention in the troubled areas of the urban scene.	31,735
Simmons College	"Women in Politics and Administrative Positions" for CE students interested in Government service. A program to involve potentially qualified women in government service	14,310

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Simmons (cont.)	through formal course work and placement in government offices for field experience.	
University of Massachusetts - Boston	"Metroplex Assembly". Through the development of organized viewing-posts and the presentation of TV programs on issues of an urgent nature to open channels of communication for the residents of Greater Boston and Eastern Massachusetts and arouse viewers and participants to see workable solutions to problems and to act upon these solutions.	$30,000

CONTINUATION PROJECTS

Dean Junior College	"Municipal Research Bureau." To continue the activities of the Municipal Research Bureau in assisting the 15 towns surrounding Franklin with the continuing problems of and new demands on local government.	17,675
Greenfield	"Assisting Local Government in the Development of Community Recreation Services: A Demonstration Project in the Town of Greenfield."	15,000

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
Greenfield (cont.)	The objective is strengthening the local municipal function of planning and implementing a total recreation program that will meet the needs of the entire community. The successful experience of the Summer Playground Program indicates such a program can be effective.	
Harvard Medical School	"Mental Health Education for Lawyers." A continuing project to develop methods for education of both perspective and practicing lawyers to be sensitive to the effects that various psychological and sociological phenomena can have on a person's legal role in society.	$11,345
Northeastern	"A Community Development Program in Alcoholism and Alcohol Education." A program designed to mobilize the Boston State Mental Health Area to provide the services necessary to identify and refer for appropriate care, the alcoholic community member.	20,000

Institution	Project	Federal Funds
SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FROM "SPECIAL MERIT" CATEGORY		
Clark University	"Center for Community Studies in Worcester." A request for supplemental funds for the project funded in Fiscal 1967. The source of the funds would be the "special merit category" - funds would be used for more staff time and travel.	$ 3,800.

ERIC Clearinghouse
SEP 10 1969
on Adult Education

END
5-5-70